Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BR 476 .P47 v.1
Perry, G. G. 1820-1897.
A history of the English
Church

Shelf.....

A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH

First Period.

FROM THE PLANTING OF THE CHURCH IN BRITAIN
TO THE ACCESSION OF HENRY VIII.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

THE STUDENT'S ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY

Second Period

FROM THE ACCESSION OF HENRY VIII. TO THE SILENCING OF CONVOCATION IN THE 18TH CENTURY. *Post* 8vo, 7*s.* 6*d.*

THE STUDENT'S ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY.

A HISTORY

OF THE

ENGLISH CHURCH

First Period

FROM THE PLANTING OF THE CHURCH IN BRITAIN
TO THE ACCESSION OF HENRY VIII.

BY G. G. PERRY, M.A.

CANON OF LINCOLN AND RECTOR OF WADDINGTON

LONDON
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET
1881

The right of translation is reserved.

Uniform with the present Work.

I. THE STUDENT'S MANUAL OF OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY. From the Creation of the World to the Return of the Jews from Captivity. With an Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament. By PHILIP SMITH, B.A. With Maps and Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

II. THE STUDENT'S MANUAL OF NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY. With an Introduction containing the connection of the Old and New Testament. By PHILIP SMITH, B.A. With Maps and Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

III. THE STUDENT'S MANUAL OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY. From the Times of the Apostles to the full Establishment of the Holy Roman Empire and the Papal Power. By PHILIP SMITH, B.A. With Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

PREFACE.

In this volume an attempt is made to give the early and mediæval history of the English Church in a concise form, but with sufficient detail to fix it on the mind of the reader. The histories we possess seem to be either too cumbrous or too jejune to satisfy the requirements of the student. The book has been compiled throughout from the original sources, but very great help has been derived from the learned labours of the band of Oxford historians — A. W. Haddan, Doctors Stubbs, Freeman, Shirley, and Bright — as well as from the excellent work of many of the Editors of the Chronicles published in the Rolls Series. But little attempt is made in this volume to criticise, or estimate the truth or fitness of the doctrines and practices which were prevalent in the Church of earlier days. These matters are merely treated as facts to be noted. One leading idea, however, seems forced upon the attention of any one who would compile an Early English Church History, viz. the relations of the National Church to that of Rome. It will perhaps be a surprise to some to discover

how constantly the Church of England is found struggling and contending against the encroachments and exactions of a foreign power, and asserting its rights against the ever-growing pretensions of Papal supremacy. It is time indeed that that shallow view of history, which sees in the Royal Supremacy a new invention of Henry VIII., were altogether discarded. The Church of England has been contending throughout for national life, which it only fully reached in the sixteenth century. Thus, this volume is strictly introductory to the one already published in the same series, containing the History of the Reformation; and forms, together with it, a complete and continuous History of the Church of England.

WADDINGTON, 1881.

THEOLOGICAL

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

TRACES OF THE HISTORY OF THE EARLY BRITISH CHURCH . 1

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS :—

A. The Liturgy of the ancient British Church . . 17
B. The Dispute as to the Calculation of Easter . . 17

CHAPTER II.—596-604.

THE PLANTING OF THE CHURCH IN KENT AND AMONG THE EAST SAXONS 18

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS :—

The Venerable Bede 33

CHAPTER III.—604-655.

THE PLANTING OF THE CHURCH IN NORTHUMBRIA . . 34

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS :—

St. Columba 45

CHAPTER IV.—632-664.

PLANTING OF THE CHURCH IN THE OTHER ENGLISH KINGDOMS —THE CONFERENCE AT WHITBY 46

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS :—

A. The Early Monasteries of England . . . 54
B. The Abbess Hilda 55
C. The Monk Cædmon 55

CHAPTER V.—668-709.

PAGE

PRIMACY OF ARCHBISHOP THEODORE 56

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS :—

A. John of Beverley 74

B. Table of the Dates of the Foundation, and Names of First Occupants of the English Sees . . . 74

CHAPTER VI.—734-803.

THE PERIOD OF THE THREE METROPOLITANS . . . 75

CHAPTER VII.—803-925.

THE PERIOD OF THE DANISH TROUBLES 89

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS :—

Joannes Scotus, named Erigena 105

CHAPTER VIII.—942-988.

THE CONTEST BETWEEN THE SECULARS AND REGULARS . . 106

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS :—

The early Life of Dunstan 121

CHAPTER IX.—988-1042.

PERIOD OF THE DANISH ASCENDENCY 122

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS :—

The Writings of Ælfric 143

CHAPTER X.—1042-1066.

CONTEST BETWEEN NATIONAL AND FOREIGN INFLUENCE IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND 144

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS :—

The Ecclesiastical Laws of Edward the Confessor . . 155

CHAPTER XI.—1066-1087.

PAGE

Foreign Influence triumphant in the English Church . 156

CHAPTER XII.—1087-1107.

Contest between the Lay and Spiritual Powers . . 176

Notes and Illustrations :—

William de St. Carileph, Bishop of Durham . . 198

CHAPTER XIII.—1107-1135.

The Establishment of the Legatine Authority in England 199

Notes and Illustrations :—

The Literary Works of Anselm 217

CHAPTER XIV.—1135-1154.

The Church in Troublous Times 218

CHAPTER XV.—1154-1170.

The great Conflict between Church and State . . 230

Notes and Illustrations :—

A. The Early Life of Thomas Becket . . . 254
B. The Constitutions of Clarendon 255

CHAPTER XVI.—1171-1213.

The Growth of the Power of Rome in England . . 257

Notes and Illustrations :—

Pope Innocent's Directions as to the way in which the Interdict was to be observed in England . . 304

CHAPTER XVII.—1213-1253.

PAGE

THE BEGINNING OF THE REACTION AGAINST ROME . . 305

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS :—

A. The Provisions of the Council of Oxford . . 350
B. The Legatine Constitutions of Cardinal Otho . . 352

CHAPTER XVIII.—1253-1272.

THE CLERGY ON THE NATIONAL SIDE AS AGAINST KING AND POPE 353

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS :—

The Constitutions of Cardinal Othobon . . . 371

CHAPTER XIX.—1272-1353.

THE NATIONALITY OF THE CHURCH FORTIFIED BY LAW . 372

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS :—

A. The various forms of summoning the Clergy . . 410
B. The Constitutions of Archbishop Peecham at Reading . 411
Archbishop Peecham's Constitutions at Lambeth . 411
C. The Suppression of the Templars in England . . 413

CHAPTER XX.—1353-1384.

THE REVOLT AGAINST MEDIÆVAL DOCTRINE—JOHN WYCLIFFE 414

CHAPTER XXI.—1384-1431.

THE REVOLT AGAINST MEDIÆVAL DOCTRINE—THE LOLLARDS . 445

CHAPTER XXII.—1447-1459.

THE REVOLT AGAINST MEDIÆVAL DOCTRINE—BISHOP PECOCK . 471

CHAPTER XXIII.—1390-1509.

PAGE

England and Rome during Fifteenth Century . . 483

CHAPTER XXIV.

Practical Religion in the Fifteenth Century . . 498

APPENDIX A.

Historical Sketch of the Election of Bishops in the Church of England 519

APPENDIX B.

Constitutions of Canterbury and York: Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries 524

Table of Succession of English Kings, Archbishops of Canterbury, and Popes 539

Chronological Table of Events 545

INDEX 553

CORRIGENDA.

Page 47, line 10, *for* has, *read* was.

Page 57, line 12, *for* Erconwald, *read* Earconbert.

Page 91, line 16, *after* Rome, *dele* comma.

Page 94, line 7, *for* has, *read* had.

Page 146, line 30
Page 171, line 15
Page 216, note
Page 537, line 32
— *for* Chrodegand, *read* Chrodegang.

Page 191, line 4, *for* such, *read* those.

Page 312, line 20, *for* de, *read* des.

Page 398, line 17, *for* was, *read* were.

Page 532, line 21, *for* 1408, *read* 1409.

Page 535, line 31
Page 558, line 55 (left col.)
for 1464, *read* 1444.

Page 556, line 63 (right col.)
for Ceolwulp, *read* Ceolwulph.

HISTORY

OF

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

FROM ITS FIRST PLANTING
TO THE ACCESSION OF HENRY VIII.

CHAPTER I.

TRACES OF THE HISTORY OF THE EARLY BRITISH CHURCH.

1. Uncertainty of the date of the commencement of Christianity in Britain. 2. The Legend of St. Joseph of Arimathea. 3. The Conjecture as to St. Paul. 4. The Legend of Lucius. 5. Christianity probably established in Britain in the second century. 6. Testimonies of Tertullian, Origen, Sozomen, Eusebius. 7. British Martyrs. 8. The Story of St. Alban. 9. Other probable Martyrs. 10. The Council of Arles. 11. Nicæa and Sardica. 12. Orthodoxy of the British Church. 13. British Bishops at Rimini. 14. Testimonies of the Fathers as to the British Church. 15. The history of Pelagius and Celestius. 16. Introduction of Pelagianism into Britain. 17. Mission of Germanus and Lupus. 18. The Roman Province of Britain Christian before the coming of the Saxons. 19. Missions of St. Ninian and St. Patrick. 20. British Church driven into Wales and Cornwall. 21. The Invective of Gildas. 22. Improvement at close of sixth century.

1. THE earlier history of Christianity in Britain must needs bear the character rather of an inquiry or investigation than of a narrative. The secular history of Roman Britain is dark and indistinct; much more so is the religious history. It is, indeed, certain that the Church of Christ had struck its roots into the soil long before the Christianising of the empire by the conversion of Constantine. But the exact date of the first appearance of Christianity in Britain it is perhaps impossible to ascertain. A passage in Gildas seems to assert that Britain received

Christianity at the very beginning of the Christian era, but the passage is evidently rhetorical, and Gildas is a writer of the sixth century.[1] The same writer also bitterly laments the absence of all records of the first planting of Christianity in the land.

2. The legends which assert that the Christian Church was first planted here by St. James, the brother of John, by St. Simon Zelotes, by St. Peter, are not worth examining. Scarcely more consideration is due to the legend of St. Joseph of Arimathea, which appears to have been first set forth by William of Malmesbury in the twelfth century, and which was unknown to the earlier writers. From this legend, however, a residuum of truth may be extracted. It seems to show that the religious house at Glastonbury was probably the oldest in the kingdom, and dated from British times, inasmuch as no rival claim for superior antiquity was ever raised against it.[2] From this it would follow that the first part of Britain that was Christianised was the south-west, and hence that the first introduction of Christianity into Britain was from Eastern rather than from Western sources, the intermediate agent being France. The West of England had a trade with the South of France, and especially with the Greek colony of Marseilles. Hence the production in Britain of a Christianity which had some special Eastern peculiarities.

3. The assertion that Christianity was first preached in Britain by St. Paul has a certain amount of probability. The Pudens and Claudia mentioned in the Second Epistle to Timothy may have been the same Pudens and Claudia the latter of whom is said by Martial to have been of

[1] The passage runs thus: "Interea glaciali frigore rigenti insulæ, et velut longiori terrarum secessu, soli visibili non proximæ, verus ille sol non de firmamento solum temporali sed de summâ etiam cœlorum arce, cuncta tempora excedenti, orbi universo præfulgidum sui coruscum ostendens tempore (ut scimus) summo Tiberii Cæsaris (quo absque ullo impedimento ejus propagabatur religio, comminata, senatu nolente, a principe morte delatoribus militum ejusdem) radios suos primum indulget, id est præcepta Christus."—Gildas, ed. Gall. p. 11.

[2] At the Council of Basle the English deputies contended for the superior antiquity of their Church against the representatives of France and Spain, on the ground of its foundation by St. Joseph of Arimathea.

British origin;[1] which would imply that St. Paul had made important British converts before the date of his last epistle. The Pomponia Græcina, said by Tacitus to have been accused of "foreign superstition" to her husband, who had been a dweller in Britain,[2] may have learned the opinions denounced (which were probably Christian tenets) in Britain. Between the fifth year of Nero, when St. Paul was set at liberty, and the fourteenth, when he suffered martyrdom, there is abundant room for a visit to Britain, and the assertion of St. Clement of Rome that he travelled "into the extreme west," and the similar expressions to be found in Basil, Chrysostom, Jerome, Epiphanius, and Theodoret, may have something more of historical value than is usually imputed to them. But in this matter we cannot go beyond conjecture.

4. There is, perhaps, less historical foundation for another legend which was a great favourite with the earlier writers, and which told how Lleuer Mawr or Lucius, a king of the Britons, became in the second century a Christian, and desiring to be better taught, sent a letter to Eleutherus, then Bishop of Rome. This story rests upon the *Catalogus Pontificum Romanorum*, written A.D. 530, and was first published by Bede. Gildas knows nothing of it. A vast array of chroniclers has repeated it, but the assertions of those separated by so long an interval prove nothing. No less than twenty-three different dates are assigned for the conversion of the supposed king,[3] and the letter which he is asserted to have sent to the Pope is utterly condemned as a forgery by its internal evidence.[4] But the legend of Lucius seems to give some support to the opinion that the Church of Christ must have been introduced into Britain at least during the second century.

5. How indeed could it be otherwise in a Roman pro-

[1] *Claudia cæruleis cum sit Rufina Britannis Edita.*—Mart. Epig. iv. 13, 1. The name of Pudens is certainly to be found in Britain. It has been identified as that of the giver of a site for a heathen temple at Colchester.—Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 22.

[2] Tacit. *Annal.* xiii. 22.

[3] See Usher, *De Britann. Eccl. Primordiis*, c. iii.

[4] First printed in 1521, and again by Lambord in the *Archaionomia.*

vince with constant communication between it and the capital, where a flourishing Christian Church existed; and in a country with a trading connection with the East, which was now everywhere full of the religion of Christ? There were probably before the close of the second century Roman Christians in Britain, as well as British Christians not converted from Roman but from other sources.

6. Tertullian, in the well-known passage in which he testifies to the existence of Christianity in Britain, specially asserts that this religion flourished among the Britons "in places which had never been approached by the Romans."[1] This testimony as to the existence of Christianity in Britain is of the beginning of the third century (208 A.D.) A little later (239) Origen speaks of Britain as having one religion, and that one the religion of Christ.[2] In another passage, however, he declares that as yet not all the Britons have received the gospel.[3] Constantius, the father of Constantine, is said by Sozomen to have favoured and supported Christianity in Britain;[4] and there are several passages in the historian Eusebius which imply the existence of a Christian British Church.[5]

7. In the terrible persecution of Diocletian at the beginning of the fourth century, there were not wanting to the British Church martyrs ready to confirm their testimony with their blood. Gildas mentions Aaron and Julius as having suffered at Caerleon, and Alban at the Roman town of Verulamium.[6] It is asserted, indeed, by Eusebius, that Constantius prevented the fury of the Diocletian persecution from being felt in Britain;[7] and Lactantius, though he declares that Constantius caused the *Conventicula*, or churches, to be destroyed, yet says that "the temple of God, which is in men, was preserved safe by him."[8]

[1] "Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita."—*Adv. Judæos*, c. vii.

[2] "Quando enim terra Britanniæ ante adventum Christi in Unius Dei convenerit religionem."—Homil. iv. in Ezek. (Jerome's Translation).

[3] Origen, Homil. xxviii. in Matt. xxiv.

[4] Sozom., *Hist. Eccles.* i. 6.

[5] *Dem. Evang.* iii. 5; *Vita Constant.* ii. 28; *Ib.* iv. 9.

[6] Gildas, *Hist.* viii. [7] Euseb., *Hist. Ecc.* viii. xiii. 12.

[8] Lactant. *de Morte Pers.* xv. xvi.

8. There is, however, so strong a tradition as to the martyrdom of St. Alban, that we must assume that *he*, at least, suffered. The tradition, as given by Bede, is as follows:—Albanus was a Roman soldier, who hospitably received and entertained a Christian priest flying from the persecution. By this priest he was instructed and baptized. The priest being discovered and sent for, the soldier changed garments with him, and presented himself in his place. Being recognised, he was ordered to sacrifice to the gods; but refused, and declared himself a Christian. Upon this he was terribly tortured. Still being constant, he was ordered to execution; but the soldier appointed to perform the office, touched by the fortitude of Albanus, refused to do his work, and also declared himself a Christian. The two were martyred together, but the name of only one of them has survived. Miracles are said to have been worked at the execution. A river dried up when Alban desired to pass. A fountain burst forth when he desired water. The eyes fell from the head of the executioner. Miracles are said to have followed his death. But that Alban was a real character and his martyrdom a real event there is no question. About the date of his death there may be more doubt.[1]

9. Upon the whole, the balance of probability seems to incline to the supposition, not only that St. Alban suffered at this time, but that many others suffered also, as Gildas and Bede assert. The courtly expression of Eusebius, who desired to flatter Constantine by eulogising his father, does not go for much; and the assertion of Lactantius as to buildings alone having suffered is somewhat rhetorical. And if persecution prevailed in Britain, there is no reason to doubt that here too, as in other places, it bore its natural fruit in the growth of the Church.

10. In the year 314 was held a Council at Arles in

1 "That St. Alban's martyrdom happened in the Diocletian persecution rests only upon the knowledge or (according to another reading) on the guess of Gildas himself. And the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the *Lib. Landavens.*, although the latter still attributes it to that persecution, date it in 286."—Haddan's Note to *Councils of Great Britain*, i. 6.

France to consider the opinions of the Donatists. At this Council, which was attended by a large number of Western bishops, three British bishops were present, and affixed their signatures to the decrees of the Council. Their names as read in the ancient Roll are—"Eborius, bishop of the town of Eboracum (York), in the province of Britain; Restitutus, bishop of the town of London, in the above northern province; Adelfius, bishop of the town of Caerleon (or perhaps Lincoln).[1] Besides these, Sacerdos, a presbyter; and Arminius, a deacon." The Synod of Arles was the most important of any that were held before the general Council of Nicæa. It had in it bishops from all parts of the Western Church. It not only condemned the Donatist heresy, but also undertook to settle other points which needed settlement, as the controversy as to the time of Easter, the baptism of heretics, the rules for discipline. It promulgated twenty-two valuable canons on these points. By the presence of some of its chief bishops at this Synod the British Church must have been well informed as to the mind of the Universal Church, while by its still preserving a way of calculating Easter different from that which was generally accepted in the West, it showed an independence and self-reliance which indicate a considerable strength.

11. There is good reason also for believing that at the great Council of Nicæa, held eleven years after that of Arles (325), British bishops were present. The Emperor Constantine, who summoned the Council, connected as he was with Britain, would naturally summon bishops from that island to the general gathering, and we have the testimony of Athanasius that the British Church accepted and assented to the faith as defined at Nicæa.[2] At the Council of Sardica (347), which acquitted Athanasius of the charges brought against him, British bishops were either present, or, if not present, signified afterwards their adhesion to the decisions of the Synod.[3]

[1] The MS. has apparently Coloniâ Londinensium, but for this we must read either *Legionensium, i.e.* Caer-Leon, or *Lindensium*, which would imply Lincoln. This latter town was an early head-quarters of the Romans, and the conjecture seems a very probable one. See Bingham, B. ix. c. 6, § 20.

[2] Athanas. *ad Jovian Imp.* [3] Athanas. *Apol. cont. Arian.*

12. There appears, indeed, to be no reason for supposing that Arianism was accepted in Britain, although Gildas, misapplying a general expression in Eusebius, asserts the contrary.[1] Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, often called the Western Athanasius for his vigorous defence of the faith, writes a congratulatory letter to the bishops of Britain (among others) on the ground of their orthodoxy.[2]

13. At the unfortunate Synod of Rimini (359), when all the more orthodox were entrapped by the Emperor Constantius into accepting an Arian formula, three British bishops were present. These are said to have been so poor that they accepted the imperial allowance when the other bishops refused it. They had previously rejected a collection made among their brethren at the Council for their support, "thinking it rather right to be burdensome to the general revenue than to individuals."[3]

14. St. Chrysostom, writing in 367, speaks of the British Islands as possessing churches and altars. In another passage he says that in Britain you may hear the truths of the gospel spoken indeed in another language, but not other in meaning.[4] Several passages in St. Jerome imply that the Britons were in the habit of making pilgrimages to the holy places in Palestine.[5] The same is also asserted by Palladius and Theodoret.[6]

15. This custom of making pilgrimages to the holy places must have tended to keep up and strengthen the connection which always seems to have existed between the British Church and that of the East, and the history of the remarkable persons now to be spoken of still further increased and strengthened this connection. Early in the fifth century one of the most conspicuous figures in the Church of that day was Pelagius, universally declared to have been a British monk; Augustine, Jerome, Prosper,

[1] *Councils*, etc. (Haddan and Stubbs), i. 8, note.

[2] Hilar. Pictav., *de Synodis Prologet.* § 2.

[3] Sulpic. Severus, *Hist. Sac.* ii. 41.

[4] Chrysost., *Cont. Judæos*, Serm. de Util. Lect. Script., in Epist. II. ad Cor. XII., Homil. xxviii.

[5] Hieron, Ep. XLIV. ad Paulam, Epist. LXXXIV. ad Oceanum.

[6] Pallad., *Hist. Lausiac*, cxviii.; Theodoret, *Philoth.*, xxvi.

Orosius, all distinctly state this. Born, according to the testimony of numberless chroniclers, in Cambria, and professed at the monastery of Bangor, he was some sixty years old[1] when his opinions began to attract attention, and to draw upon him the notice of three of the greatest of the Fathers—Augustine, Chrysostom, and Jerome. Though called a monk by all his contemporaries, it is not to be supposed that Pelagius was a Cœnobite, or bound by any special rule. He was a layman, and had adopted probably a life of contemplation and study, such as that of which an example had been given a hundred years before by Pachomius in the East. The name Pelagius was evidently one adopted to give a dignified and learned character to the man, but whether the original name was Morgan, as Camden and Usher suppose, may be doubtful. The fortunes of Pelagius are linked together with those of a friend of his named Celestius, who appears to have been of the Scotic or ancient Irish race. St. Jerome's invective against him calls him "a dog of Albion, one bred from the Scotch race, the near neighbour to the British."[2] Both these men, Pelagius and Celestius, are said by Gennadius to have written treatises before they became known and attracted notice as heretical teachers—Celestius on the monastic state, and Pelagius on the Trinity and on the religious life. About the end of the fourth century these two British monks left their Western homes, and, visiting first Egypt and then Constantinople (where they became known to St. Chrysostom), finally found themselves at Rome. They arrived there in the pontificate either of Siricius or Anastasius, in the last decade of the fourth century. At that period the absorbing business, the great topic of interest at Rome, was

[1] It is asserted by Dempster, on the faith "of a very ancient ecclesiastical writer," that he was born on the same day as Augustine, in the year 351.

[2] Professor Bright thinks that these expressions were used of Pelagius, and says—"It is an error to make Jerome refer to Celestius as Irish (*Early E. Ch. Hist.*, p. 14, note). I venture to differ from this. He also says Pelagius "had left Britain in early life." This, I think, is not so. He was some forty years old before we hear of him at Rome. An exhaustive account of Pelagius and Celestius will be found in Wiggers' *Augustinismus*, etc. (Hamburg, 1833).

religion, and the questions connected with it. Into the speculations which were everywhere rife the two Western monks entered eagerly. They speculated not on the objective truths of the nature of the Godhead, but on the subjective facts of the human will. They sought to discover how the great truth of the freedom of the will, and the manifest power which men have of choosing between two alternatives, could be reconciled with the extreme opinions which prevailed on the misery and helplessness of human nature, and the need of frightful austerities to mortify the flesh. They soon attracted attention, and rose into distinction. Before the year 399, when Ruffinus left Rome, they had become intimately acquainted with him, and had learned from him those views adapted from the speculations of Origen, which were the foundation of all their theological system. They were also intimate visitors at the house of Pammachius. Their reputation soon reached Augustine in Africa. They were known to and highly esteemed by Paulinus of Nola. Augustine wrote of them that "their abilities were great and acute." He calls them "most powerful, most renowned." Pelagius is described as "in the highest degree acute." Celestius, "a man of most vigorous judgment." The addresses and harangues of Pelagius are described as "vehement and burning." His books are made popular by "their bitter and eloquent style."[1] The sojourn of Pelagius and Celestius in Rome extended over fifteen or sixteen years. That which first caused them to be suspected of heresy was the animadversions made by Pelagius in his lectures on a book then intensely popular—the *Confessions* of St. Augustine. But his first distinct utterance of his peculiar views was conveyed in his Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, made public about the year 409. The first work of Augustine against these views (*The Epistle to Marcellinus*) was written in 412. After the devastation of Rome by Alaric, Pelagius and Celestius went first to Sicily, then to Carthage. From thence Pelagius passed on into Palestine, while Celestius remained at Carthage. They both now began to

[1] Augustinus, Epp. ad Paulinum, ad Bonifacium, ad Julianum; De Naturâ et Gratiâ; De Gestis Palæst.

teach more openly, denying the doctrine of original sin, asserting the freedom of the will, and the power of man to do right of himself, though they by no means denied the valuable help of the grace of God; asserting also the possibility of a human being reaching complete perfection. Celestius was excommunicated by a Synod at Carthage. Pelagius in Palestine was soon engaged in fierce strife with St. Jerome. The former, however, was supported by John, bishop of Jerusalem, and by a powerful party. It is not needful here to notice the various controversial writings which were put forth on the one hand by Augustine and Jerome, on the other by Pelagius and Celestius. Suffice it to say that the fragments of the writings of both these monks which remain exhibit very considerable talent and power, though they are unquestionably chargeable with false doctrine. An attempt was made by the opponents of the new views to crush them by the decisions of a Synod, but at Diospolis (the ancient Lydda) a small Synod of the bishops pronounced them to be free from heresy. This acquittal evidently arose from a misunderstanding. Eastern prelates did not fully understand the Latin terms. In Africa two Synods organised by Augustine strongly condemned the Pelagian views. An unexpected difficulty now arose for the defenders of orthodoxy, from the action of the Pope. Zosimus, a Greek who had succeeded to the papal chair, received favourably the appeals of Celestius and Pelagius, and pronounced them free of all heresy. This was in direct contradiction to the decisions of his predecessor, and he himself was soon obliged by the energetic action of Augustine to recant and acknowledge himself to have been in error. The Pelagians were now condemned by a rescript from the Court of Ravenna, and banishment and confiscation of their goods was decreed against them. But their opinions had taken deep root and spread far and wide, and an influence proceeding from the British Church, and disseminated by British teachers, affected all the chief centres of Christianity. What special effect did it have upon the Church in Britain?

16. It is asserted by Prosper that Agricola, the son of Severianus, a bishop who had adopted Pelagian views, was

the first introducer of these heretical opinions into Britain.[1] Fastidius, a British bishop, mentioned by Gennadius as a writer of a book on the Christian life, and another on preserving widowhood, was also probably a semi-Pelagian.[2]

17. The heresy spreading rapidly, the orthodox determined to ask aid to combat it from the neighbouring Church of Gaul. "An embassy," says Constantius, "directed to the Gallic bishops, informed them that the false opinions of Pelagius had spread far and wide, and that the Catholic faith needed immediate succour. With this object a numerous Synod was collected, and by the judgment of all two illustrious lights of religion are fortified by the prayers of all for the work—namely, Germanus and Lupus, apostolical priests, living, indeed, in body upon earth, but already possessing heaven by their merits."[3] Passing over into Britain, they were followed by enormous crowds, and everywhere converted the people to the true faith. The heretical leaders at last determined to oppose them openly, and before a vast assembly of the people a disputation was publicly held at Verulamium. The apostles of the truth were completely triumphant, and the people could scarce be restrained from laying violent hands on the Pelagians. Such is the account given by Constantius, a presbyter of Lyons, who wrote a life of Germanus, with whom he was contemporary. On the other hand, Prosper of Aquitain, the chronicler, attributes the mission of Germanus and Lupus to the action of Pope Celestine, who had been appealed to by Palladius the deacon, to help the endangered Church of Britain. There is no room for doubt as to the main facts, namely, that Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, and Lupus, bishop of Troyes, did visit Britain with the object

[1] Prosper, *Aquitan. Chron.*, and *Contra Collatorem*, § 58.

[2] See Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 16. This, however, is denied by Stillingfleet, who considers the book orthodox (it is printed in the *Bibl. Patrum*). The special point of *Semi-Pelagianism* was the denying the *necessity* of preventive grace. It repudiated the heresy of Pelagius in denying original sin, and all mischief from the Fall; but it asserted man's power to turn to God of himself. At the same time it held that many were drawn by the operation of grace.—Prosper, *Cont. Collatorem*, s. 40; Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, i. 130.

[3] Constantius, *de Vita Germani*, i. 19.

of instructing the people, probably in the year 429, and that they were to some extent successful. But the influence which these missionaries exerted soon passed away after their departure from Britain. The people relapsed into Pelagianism, and sorrowful messages were addressed to Germanus praying for his renewed help. Lupus being unable to join with him, Germanus appealed to Severus, bishop of Treves, for assistance, and together with him came again to Britain in the year 447. A miracle said to have been performed by Germanus in restoring a crippled youth named Elaphius to the use of his limbs, gave such prestige and force to the teaching of the Gallic bishops that the false opinions of Pelagius were utterly cast down and discredited.[1] It is to the earlier visit of Germanus that the story of the Hallelujah Battle is attributed; and there is nothing incredible in the supposition that an army of Britons contending against their pagan and un-Romanised brethren the Picts, and the allied Saxons, who had already begun to prey upon Britain, should have been stirred to martial enthusiasm by the presence of the saint, and cheered on to victory by the loud hymns raised by him and his followers.

18. Before the period when the fatal step was taken of subsidising the Saxons, the Roman province of Britain may be regarded as essentially Christian. Gildas asserts the general existence of churches in later Roman Britain. There are special records in Bede and other early chroniclers of British churches at Canterbury (St. Martin's, St. Saviour's); near Verulam; at Caerleon (two); near Chester; at Glastonbury; at Whitherne, in Galloway; near Evesham. Traces of Romano-British churches are believed still to remain at Dover, Richborough, Reculver, and Lyminge in Kent, at Brixworth in Northamptonshire, besides the numerous remains possibly belonging to a post-Roman period in Wales and Cornwall.

19. And it is an indisputable fact that the British Church not only itself flourished during the Roman occu-

[1] Constantius, *de Vita Germani*, ii. 1-4. Later legends connect Germanus with Vortigern. It is singular that Gildas knows nothing of Germanus.

pation, but that it also sent missionaries to other churches. Of the first of these, St. Ninian, Bede thus speaks :—"The Southern Picts, long time ago, as they say, left the errors of idolatry and received the true faith, having the Word of God preached to them by Ninian the bishop, a most reverend and holy man of the nation of the Britons, who had been regularly taught at Rome the Christian faith and the mysteries of the truth. His Episcopal See was made illustrious by the name of St. Martin, and by the church dedicated to him; and there he himself rests in body, together with many saints, which holy place the race of the English now holds. It is in the province of Bernicia, and is commonly called the White House (Whithern) because he made his church of stone in a fashion to which the Britons were unaccustomed."[1] Other authorities record a visit made by Ninian to St. Martin, to whom he dedicated his church; and as St. Martin died just at the close of the fourth century, the work of Ninian in Galloway must be placed early in the fifth. Another still more famous missionary of the British Church was St. Patrick, the apostle of the Irish. Among the various legends by which the work of St. Patrick is obscured there would seem to be some foundation of fact obtainable. Palladius, a Roman missionary, had first endeavoured to convert the heathen Scots (Irish), but was driven away by them and landed in Scotland, where, among the Picts, already in part Christianised by St. Ninian, he found a home, and built, as it is said, a church at Fordun. A young Briton who had come under his influence and been told by him of the heathen inhabitants of the neighbouring island, was stirred up to attempt the work in which Palladius had failed. His father was Calphurnius, a noble Briton, and his mother Conche, niece to St. Martin of Tours. He gave himself to the work, and succeeded in planting Christianity in Ireland.

20. The irruptions of the Saxons and Angles into Britain, and the wars carried on during a century, almost uniformly with bad success to the Britons, had the effect of filling the main part of this island with heathen colonists. The Britons, whether Christian or pagan, were either

[1] Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 4.

exterminated, made slaves of, or driven into two main districts—the one on the west, extending from the Clyde to the Dee; the other in the south-west, comprising Cornwall, Devon, and part of Somerset. In these two districts, and among the mountains of Wales, whatever was left of the British Church was to be found. What was its condition and history during these times of trouble? The most that we know about these is to be found in the work of Gildas, a Welsh monk who wrote, about 564, an epistle or history of the destruction of Britain. From this we gather the saddest ideas both as to the sufferings which the British Church had to endure, and also as to the moral and religious condition of the British Christians.

21. Gildas begins his work by a sketch of the irruptions—first of the Picts and Scots, and afterwards of the Saxons, by which the Britons were in a great measure exterminated, the remnants of the nation being driven into Wales and Cornwall. The battle of Badon Hill (520), in which the Britons were victorious, gave them an era of comparative peace. But, he continues, though foreign attacks ceased, civil wars continued. The country was desolate, and when the generation which had had to fight for its existence had passed away, a new one arose which was worse than the former. Then Gildas turns his Invective with terrible energy against the chiefs and judges of the land, accusing them by name of fearful crimes and wickedness. "I wish," he then exclaims, "that I could stop here, but I am constrained to censure also the clergy. Some indeed there are among them of high excellence, but for the most part it is not so. Priests they are, but foolish ones; ministers, but shameless; clerks, but robbers; shepherds, but rather wolves; having the buildings of the church, but only entering them for gain; teaching the people, but showing them the most evil example; offering the sacrifice but seldom, and never with a pure heart; not rebuking the people for their sins, as truly doing the same themselves; spurning the precepts of Christ, and desiring only to satisfy their lusts; sitting in the chair of St. Peter with unclean feet; hating truth and favouring lies; looking upon the righteous who are poor with fierce

looks, and venerating the wicked who are rich as angels of heaven, without any shame ; preaching the giving of alms, but giving none ; passing over in silence the crimes of the people, but amplifying the injuries which they themselves had suffered as though they were done to Christ ; driving from their homes mothers and sisters, and bringing in other women to live with them without any regard to decency ; being more eager for promotion in the Church than for the kingdom of heaven, but using their offices tyrannically and not illustrating them with righteous living ; careless and inattentive to the precepts of the saints ; eager and intent upon amusement and the foolish fables of secular men ; imitating bulls in their fatness and bellowing ; miserably eager for all forbidden things ; arrogant in look ; of the very lowest debasement in conscience ; sad for the loss of a penny, glad to gain one ; dull and dumb in apostolic exhortations, most learned in the tricks of worldly business ; rushing into the priesthood by means of bribery, and when in it, either as bishops or priests, continuing to roll in the mire of pollution ; with the name of priests indeed, but not the character, being not fitted for the apostolical dignity even by penitence for the sins they have committed, yet aspiring to all, even the highest grade, to which none ought to be preferred save the holy and perfect and the true imitators of the apostle. These men buy the office of priesthood, not from the successors of the apostles, but from the tyrants, desiring it as the cover and protection of their wicked lives. Those who sacrilegiously ordain them have obtained their offices in the same way. If they cannot force themselves on a parish, they go into foreign parts and then return to their country puffed up by excessive pride, laying their hands violently on the venerable altars, and polluting the Christian sacrifice. It is true that there are some among them who are not wicked, or proud, or schismatical, but inasmuch as these do not denounce their evil brethren, and take a stand against them, they are polluted by them. Where are there any to be found like the holy fathers? where any who correspond to the character given in the Holy Scriptures of the ministerial office? My words are indeed harsh, but

a milder tone would only serve to anoint the wound, not to cut out the infected part. St. Paul says that he who desires the office of a bishop desireth a good work. Ye desire it simply for the sake of avarice. 'A bishop,' he says, 'must be the husband of one wife.' Your bishops are not content with one, but have many wives. If they are hospitable, it is to gain popularity. They are strikers and violent. They do not attempt to govern their households. The deacons are in all things the very opposite to that which St. Paul has ordered them to be. How can those either loose or bind who are themselves dissolved in sin and bound in iniquity? May God's anger be averted from the Church defiled by such evil pastors!" Such is the substance of the Invective of Gildas against the British Church of his day; and though allowance must be made for its oratorical inflation, it yet remains a truly terrible indictment.

22. "One is almost led to think," says Professor Bright, "that Gildas's bitter complaints were effective, for there is certainly a burst of religious activity in the Welsh Church during the second half of the sixth century. Colleges or monasteries did much for study and devotion, usually bearing the name of *Bangor*—that is, 'high choir or circle,' or 'eminent community.'"[1] Of these Bangors four are enumerated; and some four or five colleges for the instruction of clergy are known to have existed. Welsh Synods also were held, the notices of which have been recovered and illustrated by the labours of Messrs. Haddan and Stubbs, and Welsh missions were sent to Ireland, "thus repaying the charity which had spread the Church in Cornwall."[2] Two Welsh bishops were especially famous—Dubricius, the founder of the church of Llandaff, and Dewi or David, the national saint of Wales and the founder of St. David's. The most ancient See was that of Caerleon, an occupant of which had perhaps attended the Council of Arles. Thus the Church in Britain struggled on, in comparative obscurity indeed, but not without signs of life and vigour, until two powerful reinforcements, coming the one from the north, the other from the south, gave

[1] Bright, *Early English Church*, p. 29. [2] *Ib.* p. 31.

to Christianity in the island a vast increase of power and extension.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A) THE LITURGY OF THE ANCIENT BRITISH CHURCH.

A document of the eighth century affirms that the British Church had a Liturgy different from the Gallican. It traces this through German and Lupus to St. Mark. It is probable, however, that the British Church had from the first the Gallican use. Bishop Forbes (Preface to Arbuthnot Missal) holds that the earliest use in these islands was Ephesine, *i.e.* Gallican. Probably, German and Lupus made no change of importance in the Liturgy which they found in use in the country. See Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, Article "Liturgy."

(B) THE DISPUTE AS TO THE CALCULATION OF EASTER.

The complicated dispute about Easter, which was such a bone of contention between the British and Roman Churches, may be thus simply stated. The *original* dispute was, whether Easter should be kept on a fixed day of the month (the 14th), following the Jewish Passover, and disregarding the day of the week, or on a fixed day of the week, namely, the first. The Nicene Council affirmed the latter as the proper principle of the celebration. Then, it having been decided that Easter should always be on Sunday, the question arose, What Sunday? The Sunday that fell next after the full moon of the first month. But when did the first (lunar) month commence, and when did the full moon fall? To determine this, and to make the lunar and solar months agree, various cycles or periods of calculation were devised, at the expiration of which the lunar and solar months would correspond. Without specifying these, which were all more or less faulty, it is sufficient to say that the Church generally had accepted a calculation or cycle, different from that which was held by the British Churches. But this was not the most important point of difference. The British Churches held, probably on account of some tradition supposed to be handed down from St. John, that Easter Sunday might be *on the fourteenth* of the month, if that day happened to be Sunday; the rest of the Church held, as ordered by the Council of Nice, that Easter Sunday *could not be before the fifteenth*. It was possible, therefore, for the British Christians to be celebrating their Easter on the fourteenth, while the Roman Christians celebrated theirs on the twenty-first. This, in reality, as we learn from Bede's account of the conference at Whitby, was the matter of contention between them. The British Christians then alleged the authority of St. John, who was held to have supported the original plan of always adhering to the fourteenth of the month; but they did not in truth follow this tradition entirely, inasmuch as they did not hold that the fourteenth could be the right day, *except it were a Sunday*. They were thus not altogether *Quartodecimans*. For further information on the Easter Controvery see Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, Article "Easter."

CHAPTER II.

THE PLANTING OF THE CHURCH IN KENT AND AMONG THE EAST SAXONS.

596–604.

1. The Divisions of England after its conquest by the Saxons, Angles, and Jutes. 2. Circumstances likely to influence the heathen settlers to embrace Christianity. 3. Special circumstances in the case of the Bretwalda Ethelbert. 4. Gregory sends the mission to England. 5. His Letter to encourage the timid monks. 6. Gregory's Letters to the Bishops of France. 7. The reception of Augustine and his companions by King Ethelbert. 8. Establishment of Augustine at Canterbury; his consecration, and questions addressed to Pope Gregory. 9. Gregory's Letter to Eulogius. 10. The Mission of Mellitus, Justus, Paulinus, and Ruffinianus. 11. Gregory's scheme for the hierarchy of England. 12. Ethelbert's donations: commencement of the Cathedral of Canterbury. 13. Augustine's negotiations with the British Bishops. 14. Establishment of the Church at London and Rochester. 15. Consecration of Laurentius to Canterbury. Death of Augustine.

1. WHEN, towards the end of the sixth century, wars had in great measure ceased in this island, and the invading tribes had effected a permanent settlement, the various nations are found to be distributed as follows:—In the extreme north beyond the Forth were located the two Celtic nations of Picts and Scots; the former to the east, the latter to the west, in close proximity to its brethren in Ireland. From the mouth of the Clyde right down to the Land's End, in Cornwall, the whole western part of the island was occupied by the conquered British, forming the three kingdoms of Strathclyde, North Wales, and West Wales. In the other parts of the island there were new settlers. These consisted of three tribe, all of Teutonic origin—the Jutes, the Saxons, and the Angles. Of these, the Jutes held the county of Kent, the Isle of Wight, and

part of Hampshire; the remainder of the southern part of the island being divided into the three Saxon kingdoms of Essex, Wessex, and Sussex. From the Thames to the Forth, the three large provinces of Mercia, Deira, and Bernicia were peopled by Angles, while the same tribe also occupied the easterly jut of the island to the north of the Saxon Essex. These were the main tribal divisions, though there were numerous other smaller ones, as the Hwiccians, along the estuary of the Severn; the North Folk and South Folk, in East Anglia. If we include Deira and Bernicia in the one province of Northumbria, we shall find seven prominent kingdoms of the Teutonic settlers. Of these, one or other always had a sort of recognised leadership, and its chief assumed, and was allowed, the name of Bretwalda—a foreshadowing of the union of the whole nation under one king, the first real approach to which was made in the ninth century.[1]

2. At the close of the sixth century the Bretwalda, or leading prince in England, was Ethelbert, sovereign of the Jutish kingdom of Kent. He and his people were heathens, worshippers of Woden and Thor, the fierce war-gods of the northern tribes; but in his territories were the remains of Romano-British Christianity, and among the subject population of the land there were some who cherished the Christian faith. No efforts had been made by the British Church to preach Christianity to the Saxons, Angles, or Jutes; nor would such efforts, if they had been made, have had any probability of success. The mutual hatred and contempt of the Teutons and the Celts, the savage exterminating wars in which they had been constantly engaged, made the breach between them too wide for any peaceful approaches to be welcomed. Christianity, if it was to come to the English race, must come from a quarter more respected than the despised and conquered dwellers in Wales and Cornwall. The irruptions of the various northern nations had dislocated and overthrown the old effete framework of the Roman Empire of the West; but the force of the civilisation, and the grand traditions of the countries into which they had violently thrust themselves, exercised

[1] Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, i. 28.

a strong influence over the new settlers. In all cases they were quickly subdued by the religion which the old empire had professed. The heathen conquerors of Britain were indeed slower in this respect than any other Teutonic nation, for Britain was less thoroughly Romanised than either Gaul, Spain, or Italy. The Angles and Saxons "did not find that perfect and striking fabric of Roman laws, manners, and arts, which elsewhere impressed the minds of the conquerors and changed them from destroyers into disciples."[1] But they found enough to dispose them to regard with reverence the authority and greatness of Rome. They knew that kindred nations had been taught from this great ecclesiastical centre, and so, when the fierce wars with the Celts had subsided, the new settlers were in fact predisposed to receive Christianity, should it come to them from a quarter which they respected, and not from one which they despised. Thus Pope Gregory, writing to the kings of the Franks, says:—"We are informed that through the mercy of God the English nation is desirous to turn Christian; but the clergy of your nation, notwithstanding their neighbourhood, refuse to assist them in their good motives and encourage their piety."[2]

3. In the case of the Bretwalda Ethelbert, this predisposition was increased by the fact of his being married to a Christian Frankish princess, Bertha, daughter of Charibert, king of Paris. This points to the fact of a very considerable amount of intercourse between the English and the Christianised Franks of Paris. Queen Bertha was allowed the quiet exercise of her religion. She had as chaplain Liuthard, bishop of Senlis, and as a place of worship the old Romano-British church of St. Martin's, by Canterbury. It was not altogether, then, as to a heathen country, where the greatest hostility was to be expected to the faith which they preached, that the Roman missionaries came to England.

4. The Roman mission to convert England was due to the zeal and charity of Gregory the Great, one of the greatest, if not one of the wisest, of the popes. The story told by Bede, and in the Life of Gregory by John the

[1] Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, i. 19. [2] Greg., *Ep.*, l. 5, c. 58.

Deacon, of his seeing the fair-haired slave boys in the market at Rome, and the making a vow to labour to fit those children of bright and beauteous looks for the society of the angels in heaven, may be perfectly authentic. Certainly Gregory, some years before he reached the popedom, did himself set out on a mission to redeem his vow; but the mutiny of the people, who saw in him the one able and virtuous man of the city, compelled the pope to recall him. Then when he reached the supreme power, he took measures to perform by deputy what he had been hindered from doing in person. In the fourth year of his pontificate he summoned from the monastery of St. Andrew, of which he had been abbot, the monk Augustine and some forty companions, and charged them to go on a mission to the West to convert the heathen islanders. They proceeded on their journey by way of Lerins and Marseilles to Aix; but there their heart failed them. Probably they heard accounts of the ferocity of the English, and feeling themselves but ill suited for the work from their ignorance of the language and customs of the islanders, they despaired of success. They sent Augustine, as the leading man among them, back to Rome to remonstrate with the pope, and to demand a release from the burden laid on them.

5. But Gregory was not inclined to yield to their fickleness and timidity. He sent back Augustine with a letter to encourage them. "Gregory, the servant of the servants of God, to the servants of our Lord.—Forasmuch as it had been better not to begin a good work than to think of desisting from that which has been begun, it behoves you, most beloved sons, to fulfil the good work which by the help of the Lord you have undertaken, being assured that much labour is followed by an eternal reward. When Augustine your chief returns, whom we also constitute your abbot, humbly obey him in all things; knowing that whatsoever you shall do by his direction, will in all respects be available for your souls. Almighty God protect you with His grace! and grant that I may in the heavenly country see the fruits of my labour."[1]

6. In addition to exhortations addressed to the mis-

1 Bede, I. xxiii.

sionaries themselves, Gregory paved the way for their work by letters addressed to the bishops of the Franks. To the prelates of Lyons, Marseilles, Aix, Arles, Vienne, Autun, Orleans, Metz, Saintes, and Tours, he wrote recommending Augustine and his companions to their "priestly affections," and bidding them afford them all the comfort in their power. Augustine was to inform the bishops of the object of his journey, which, the pope doubted not, would induce them "zealously to afford him relief." The pope also wrote to the king and queen of the Franks, to request their good offices for the missionaries.

7. In France they were kindly entertained during the winter. In the spring of the year 597 (14th April) Augustine and his companions, together with some French priests, arrived on the shores of England. They had been furnished with interpreters, and had learned, no doubt, somewhat of the character of the race which they were to endeavour to instruct, and of the country to which they were bound. Ethelbert, the powerful king of Kent, whose authority was recognised right up to the Humber,[1] heard that a band of strangers had landed at Ebbfleet, in the Isle of Thanet, the old cradle of the Jutish power, from whence Æsc had gone forth to conquer Kent, of whose descendants, the Æscingas, Ethelbert was fourth. His command was that the strangers should remain in the island, then separated by nearly a mile of water from the mainland, and that they should be furnished with all necessaries. Often had he heard of the religion of the Christians, which it was reported these men came to teach, from his wife Bertha;[2] but, occupied in his wars and in securing his position as Bretwalda, he had paid but slight attention to it. But he had not opposed or discountenanced the true faith, so that it is only reasonable to suppose that there were many about the court and in the

[1] Bede, i. 25. This, of course, means *over-lordship*, not direct authority.

[2] In a letter addressed by Pope Gregory to this princess, he somewhat reflects upon her for not doing more to propagate the knowledge of Christianity; but it does not appear whether the reproach was deserved. She had been married to Ethelbert some twenty-six years when Augustine came.—Greg., *Ep.* vi. 59.

neighbourhood who had been attracted towards the religion of the queen. Now that an imposing embassy had arrived from the most famous city of the West, the king was constrained to listen more attentively to any reasons that might be urged why he should quit the faith of his ancestors. Accordingly, within a few days after the arrival of the monks, Ethelbert visited the Isle of Thanet and commanded the strangers to be brought into his presence. He was careful to receive them in the open air, to avoid the dangers of magical incantations. "But they came," says Bede, "furnished with divine, not magic virtue, bearing a silver cross for a banner, and the image of our Lord and Saviour painted on a board; and, singing the litany, they offered up their prayers to the Lord for the eternal salvation both of themselves and of those to whom they were come."[1] The king answered their exhortations by declining for himself to accept the faith which they preached, but allowing them to make it known to his subjects, and promising them favourable treatment. The missionaries were then suffered to go to the city of Canterbury, which they entered in procession, chanting their litany with petitions for the success of their work in the city which they were entering.

8. At once, when they were located in Canterbury, Augustine and his monks began to practise the regular life to which they had been accustomed in their old home. The people were much struck by their discipline and devotion. They worshipped in the church of St. Martin, which had been built by the Romans; and here, too, they were ready to instruct the people, and to baptize any who were ready to embrace the faith. Of these Ethelbert himself soon was one. Within two months of the entry of the Roman monks into Canterbury, on Whitsunday (June 1, 597), King Ethelbert was baptized. This was an immense help to the work, but the king, taking a just view of the religion which he had adopted, refused to constrain any of his subjects to follow his example, but left them free to

[1] Bede, I. xxv. According to Ælfric their preaching was to set forth "quemadmodum misericors Jesus propriâ ipsius passione orbis hujusce universitatis peccationem redemerat et omnibus vere fidelibus in cœlestia regna aditum patefecerat."—Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 11.

choose for themselves. To the missionaries whose faith he had accepted, King Ethelbert made liberal presents, and gave them every facility for their work. Augustine, finding the work going on so happily, now considered it necessary to apply for episcopal consecration, which he had been directed by Gregory to seek from the French bishops. He went to Arles, where the apostolical succession was conveyed to him by the hands of Vergilius the archbishop (November 16, 597). But he was quickly back in Kent again, intent upon the prosecution of his work. So rapidly did this proceed, that on Christmas Day, 597, no less than 10,000 persons were baptized. Augustine was able to send to Gregory the happy news of this great progress by Laurentius a priest and Peter a monk—to tell him of the conversion and zeal of the king, of his own consecration, and of the numbers now made Christians, and at the same time to seek from the experience and wisdom of the Bishop of Rome directions as to several points on which he needed advice. The first matter on which he desired direction was as to the proportion in which the funds entrusted to the bishop by the faithful were to be distributed. Gregory suggested in reply that they should be made into four portions—one for the bishop and his household, another for the clergy, a third for the poor, and the fourth for the repair of churches. Inasmuch, however, as Augustine was to live the cœnobitic life with his clergy, it would not be necessary to make a division between his share and that of the clergy, only to take care that any clergy who desired to marry should receive their stipends separately. Augustine's second question was as to the liturgical uses—What was he to do in this respect, as one custom prevailed in the Roman Church, another in the Gallican? The Pope replies, "You know the custom of the Roman Church in which you were brought up. But it pleases me that if you have found anything either in the Roman, or the Gallican, or any other church, which may be more acceptable to Almighty God, you carefully make choice of the same, and sedulously teach the Church of the English, which is as yet new in the faith, whatsoever you can gather from the several churches. For things are not to be loved for the sake

of places, but places for the sake of good things. Choose, therefore, from every church those things that are pious, religious, and upright; and having, as it were, made them up in one mass, let the minds of the English be accustomed thereto." The third question related to the punishment to be exacted from those who stole from the churches. Some, said the Pope, should be fined, others scourged, but due moderation was to be observed in punishment, and all things done in charity. The fourth question was whether two brothers could lawfully marry two sisters. Gregory, of course, replied that there was nothing to hinder this. The fifth question was as to the degrees of affinity within which matrimony might be contracted. Gregory pronounces against the marriage of first cousins, and of the deceased wife's sister, but he would not have those who had contracted such marriages in their unbelieving days excluded from communion. The sixth question asked whether bishops might be consecrated when there was only one to consecrate. Gregory's answer is that it might be done, but that it was better that three or four should be present, and Augustine was to endeavour to arrange accordingly. In the next place Augustine asked how he was to stand towards the neighbouring bishops. The Pope replied that he had no authority over the bishops of France, but as to those of Britain, "he committed them to his care, that the unlearned might be taught, the weak strengthened by persuasion, and the perverse corrected by authority." The eighth and ninth questions related to certain details of married life and of supposed impediments to religious acts, as to which it is sufficient to say that Gregory's answers were full of good sense.[1] Indeed, the whole of the Pope's directions are marked by this quality, especially that which relates to an establishment of an "English use," and the not seeking an exact uniformity with Rome. The most objectionable part of his utterances is that in which he quietly disposes of the British bishops over whom he had no sort of authority, and subjects them to Augustine's rule, who could have no claim to govern them.[2]

[1] Bede, B. I. c. xxvii.

[2] The answers to Augustine's questions were not sent till 601.

9. On receiving the good news brought him by Laurentius and Peter, Gregory was able to write to Eulogius, Patriarch of Alexandria, that he rejoiced to hear tidings from him as to the conversion of heretics, and that he was glad to be able to make a return of a similar piece of good news. "I must tell you," he writes, "that the nation of the English has remained up to the present time in unbelief, adoring gods of wood and stone. I have sent thither a monk of my monastery, whom the bishops of Germany[1] —having ordained bishop by my allowance—have caused to be conveyed thither at the extremity of the world, and we have just received news of the happy success of their labours. For he, and they that are with him, perform so many miracles, that they seem to be almost equal to those of the Apostles. We have learned that at the festival of Christmas last this new bishop baptized more than ten thousand English. I write this to you that you may see the effect of your prayers."[2]

10. The work growing thus rapidly, Augustine felt the urgent need of additional helpers of somewhat a higher class and greater power than those companions he had brought with him. Gregory, to whom his needs were communicated, was of the same mind. He thought the time was now come for a more formal establishment of Augustine as the head of the Church, and generally for a strong reinforcement of the Church which had been so happily planted. Accordingly, as Bede tells us, he now sent the pall[3] to Augustine, which was held to give him the authority of a Metropolitan over a province of bishops, and with this he despatched some whom he had selected to be helpers to him—viz. Mellitus, Justus, Paulinus, and Ruffinianus. These missionaries also carried with them "all things in general for the worship and service of the Church—viz. sacred vessels and vestments for the altars,

[1] "St. Gregory calls the kingdom of France Germany, either because in reality it included a part of Germany, or because the nation of the Franks was of German origin."—Fleury.

[2] Greg., *Ep.* vii. 30.

[3] Originally a grand outer robe, but gradually reduced in dimensions to be a little stole or tippet of lambswool undyed.

also ornaments for the churches, and vestments for the priests and clerks, as likewise relics of the holy apostles, besides many books."[1] But the most remarkable and important part of this second mission, which reached England in the year 601, was the advice which Gregory despatched to Augustine not only in answer to the questions which had been proposed to him, but also as to his way of treating the heathen temples, and generally all those practices of heathenism to which the English had been accustomed. With an extraordinary largeness of mind Gregory charged Mellitus to advise Augustine, as from him, not to interfere with the heathen temples save only to destroy the idols, but to sprinkle the temples with holy water, and then to erect altars in them as Christian churches. He also advised him to substitute Christian festivals in the place of the heathen feasts, which might be observed with somewhat of the same ceremonies; for, says the Pope, "It is impossible to efface everything at once from their obdurate minds; because he who endeavours to ascend to the highest place rises by degrees or steps and not by leaps."[2] There is no doubt that to this wise and politic advice the rapid spread of Christianity among the Saxons and Angles was greatly owing.

11. By another letter despatched to Augustine himself by the hands of the second mission, Gregory appointed the future arrangement and subordination of bishoprics in England. Augustine himself was, during his lifetime, to be at the head of all; he was to consecrate twelve bishops under him, of whom the Bishop of London was, at the death of Augustine, to have the primacy. And as London had been the chief city of the southern portion of Roman Britain, and so was to have the honour of being the Metropolitan See, thus also the city which in the northern division had enjoyed a similar precedence, viz. Eboracum or York, was to be the metropolis of the north, and its bishop was to have the pall conferred upon him when appointed. Under each metropolitan in Gregory's scheme there were to be twelve suffragans, and the seniority of consecration was to

[1] Bede, I. xxix. See for an account of these Thomas de Elmham (ed. Hardwick), p. 96.

[2] Bede, I. xxx.

give the actual primacy either to the Bishop of London or to the Bishop of York, as the case might be.[1]

12. Gregory also wrote letters by the same messengers to King Ethelbert and Queen Bertha. He praises Ethelbert for the zeal which he had already shown for Christ, and exhorts him to use his utmost endeavours for the spreading of the truth among his subjects. To Bertha he writes that though she had begun late, yet now at last, having begun, she should strive the more zealously to influence her husband in his love for the gospel, and his zeal for spreading it abroad. To both of them he recommends Augustine and the other holy men whom he had sent for the conversion of the nation.[2] To Augustine himself he writes what probably was a salutary caution against pride and self-exaltation. He had, it seems, claimed to have been the means of working many miracles in carrying on his missionary labours. Gregory bids him rejoice with fear, "lest amidst the wonders that are wrought, the weak mind may be puffed up in its own presumption, and as it is externally raised to honour it may thence inwardly fall by vainglory. For we must call to mind that when the disciples returned with joy after preaching, and said to their Heavenly Master, 'Lord, even the very devils are subject unto us in Thy name,' they were presently told: 'In this rejoice not, that the devils are subject unto you; but rather rejoice because your names are written in heaven.' For all the elect do not work miracles, and yet the names of all are written in heaven." Augustine is bid to remember his shortcomings, which ought to extinguish all vanity, and to reflect that if any miraculous effects had been shown, this was done, not for him, but for the sake of those whose salvation had been given to him.[3] While the Roman Bishop was thus fostering the beginnings of the Church in England, the newly

[1] It is unnecessary to note that this arrangement was never carried out, but the directions as to the relative position of the Metropolitans gave occasion to the long contest waged by York against Canterbury on this point.

[2] Greg., *Epist.* ix. 39. Bede, I. xxxii.

[3] Bede, I. xxxi.

converted king of Kent was showing himself solicitous for its temporal interests. Retiring from his palace in Canterbury to Reculver, he gave up the former to the uses of Augustine and the missionaries. Near the king's palace was an old Roman church long desecrated. This Augustine reclaimed and rededicated as Christ Church, enlarging it with choir and aisles and apses in imitation of the Vatican Basilica of St. Peter at Rome. This was the original of the venerable cathedral of Canterbury. He then proceeded to erect outside the city walls a monastery on the site of an old Roman Temple, which he dedicated to SS. Peter and Paul, and with the help of Ethelbert, who "enriched it with several donations,"[1] he was able rapidly to advance it. This was the monastery afterwards called by the name of its founder, St. Augustine's.[2] Having full license now to reclaim for the purposes of worship any of the old Romano-British churches, he also recovered, and rededicated in the name of St. Pancras, another ancient Roman church near Canterbury.

13. The powers given by Pope Gregory to Augustine of being supreme over all Christians in the island, naturally led him soon to attempt to bring the British churches under his regulation, and to make them submit to his authority. The antipathies of race, and the recollections of the long and bitter struggles between the Britons and the Teutons, would necessarily form a great impediment, but it was thought that the faith common to the two might overcome this. And had the demands of Augustine been less exacting, or his demeanour more conciliating, this might have been the case. A meeting was arranged between the Archbishop and certain representatives from the British churches of Wales, at a place which is described by Bede as "Augustine's Ac," that is Augustine's Oak, on the borders of the Wiccii and West Saxons."[3] The way in which Augustine commenced the

[1] Bede, I. xxxiii.

[2] On the question as to the relative antiquity of Christ Church and St. Augustine's a great strife arose. (See Thomas of Elmham, Rolls Series, pp. 84, 85, etc.)

[3] Bede, ii. 2. The Wiccii or Hwiccians were settled along the banks

interview did not promise well for its success. He began by admonishing the Britons as to the irregularity of their proceedings, especially in the matter of keeping Easter, which they persisted in observing on the 14th day of the month when the full moon fell rightly for this, whereas the custom now generally accepted in the Church did not allow the festival by any possibility to be observed before the 15th,[1] in order to avoid the day of the Jews' Passover. Other customs and traditions of the British Church were also denounced. The British clergy naturally defended their long-practised customs. Augustine, instead of a friendly argument with them, demanded that the matter should be settled by a trial as to which of the parties could work a miracle. A blind man was brought who (it is said) could not be cured by the British, but was immediately healed by the prayers of Augustine. There must have been some suspicious circumstances connected with this transaction, as the British clergy do not seem to have been struck and awed by it. They demanded another meeting. At this seven British bishops and many learned men from their famous monastery of Bangor assisted. They had previously consulted a hermit renowned for his piety as to whether they ought to forsake their traditions at the bidding of Augustine. The hermit had told them that if Augustine showed himself meek and humble they might do so. They were to judge as to his humility by observing whether he rose up to receive them when they came to him. Augustine remained sitting. The British bishops charged him with pride and haughtiness. Augustine replied that many of their traditions were contrary to those of the universal church, but that if they would abandon their computation of Easter, and their peculiar mode of administering baptism, and would join with him in preaching the gospel to the English, he would readily tolerate all their other peculiarities. They responded that they would change none of their customs. Then Augustine threatened

of the Severn. The place is supposed to have been the village of Aust or Aust-cliff on the Severn, in Gloucestershire.

[1] See above, Notes and Illustrations to Chap. I.

them, that if they would not seek to convert the English, they would suffer death at their hands. His threat received so marked a fulfilment, that on the one hand it was held to have been a prophecy, on the other, he has been charged with complicity in the massacre which followed, though it was certainly some nine years after his death.[1] For Ethelfrid, king of the Northumbrians, making war upon the British, defeated them in a great battle near Chester. During the battle a large body of the monks of Bangor were observed by the pagans occupied in prayer for the success of the arms of their countrymen. "These men," said the Northumbrian king, "are fighting against us as much as the others." The conquering Angles fell upon them, and out of the twelve hundred monks only fifty survived.

14. The unsuccessful negotiations with the British are generally assigned to the year 603; and in the following year, 604, Augustine made a great step forward in establishing the Church of Christ among the English. Sebert, the king of the East Saxons, was the nephew of Ethelbert of Kent, being the son of his sister Ricola. The Christian missionaries, therefore, obtained an easy access into his dominions, which contained the great city of London, the opulence and importance of which had been scarcely injured by the Anglo-Saxon conquest,[2] and which was then, as in Roman times, by far the leading city in the island. Here were two famous temples of the Roman heathen worship, one of Diana in the centre of the city, and another of Apollo in the neighbouring island of Thorney. Sebert, now converted to the faith, determined, in

[1] The massacre of the Welsh monks by Ethelfrid was "almost certainly" in 613 (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*). It seems strange that so many writers have attempted to connect Augustine with this massacre, inasmuch as it is certain that he died in 604. Bede carefully notes that the massacre took place after the death of Augustine. (Bede, ii. 2). It has been suggested that the passage in Bede is an interpolation, because it is not found in King Alfred's translation. This probably may be accounted for. The passage is in all the most ancient MSS. of Bede. There can be no good ground for supposing that Augustine had anything to do with the massacre. See Collier, i. 180, *sq.*

[2] Palgrave, *Hist. of England*, i. 61.

concert with Ethelbert, to build on these sites two great Christian churches; the one in the city to be dedicated to St. Paul, the other at Thorney to St. Peter.[1] For this promising field of mission labour one of the band of Roman missionaries, Mellitus, was set apart by Augustine, and consecrated the first bishop of London. At the same time, for further help in his own nearer neighbourhood, another bishop was consecrated for a portion of the county of Kent. The place chosen for his See was the town of Rof, the Englishman, where King Ethelbert built a church in honour of St. Andrew, and endowed it with many gifts.[2] This church was entrusted to Justus, consecrated by Augustine the first bishop of Rochester.

15. One other important act was done by Augustine before his earthly work was completed. Fearing "lest upon his death the state of the Church, as yet unsettled, might begin to falter if it should be destitute of a pastor even for an hour," he consecrated Laurentius to be his successor at Canterbury.[3] After this the prelate who had been instrumental in performing so great a work, and who, in spite of probable imperfections and mistakes, had performed it so admirably, died May 26, 604, and was buried near to the church of St. Peter and St. Paul, which was fast rising through the zeal of Ethelbert. As soon as the building was in a sufficiently advanced state to be dedicated, the body of the first Archbishop of Canterbury was brought within it and buried in the north porch.[4]

[1] The ancient condition of the city of Westminster is thus described by Sir F. Palgrave: "On the western side of the city, and at the distance of nearly two miles, a small river which fell into the Thames formed an island so overgrown with thickets and brushwood, that the Saxons called it Thorney, or the Isle of Thorns. The river surrounding Thorney crept sullenly along the plashy soil, and the spot was so wild and desolate that it is described as a fearful and terrible place, which no one could approach after nightfall, without great danger."—*Hist. of England*, i. 62.

[2] Bede, ii. 3. The grants of Ethelbert were recognised by the Witan or Parliament, and specially protected, which is the first recognition of Christianity in England by law. [3] *Ib.* ii. 4.

[4] In 613, under the episcopate of Laurentius.—Thomas de Elmham (ed. Hardwicke), p. 132.

Upon his tomb was inscribed the epitaph, "Here rests the Lord Augustine, first Archbishop of Canterbury, who being formerly sent hither by the blessed Gregory, Bishop of the city of Rome, and by God's assistance supported with miracles, reduced King Ethelbert and his nation from the worship of idols to the faith of Christ, and having ended the days of his office in peace, died the 7th day of the kalends of June, in the reign of the same king."[1]

[1] Bede, ii. 3.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

THE VENERABLE BEDE.

The historian on whom we depend for all the earlier portion of English Church history was a very remarkable person. He was a native of Bernicia, the northern province of Northumbria, and was born in a village which afterwards belonged to the two monasteries of St. Peter and St. Paul at Wearmouth and Jarrow. The time of his birth was about 673. He was committed in his early youth to the abbot Benedict to be instructed, and began his education in the House of Wearmouth. The abbot was a man singularly learned for his age, and Bede took every advantage of his instructions. He then passed to the House of Jarrow, under the abbot Ceolfrid, also a traveller and a learned man. About the nineteenth year of his age, he was ordained deacon by John of Beverley, Bishop of Hexham, and at the age of thirty, priest by the same bishop. Bede now began to put to a practical use the studies in which he had been long engaged. He wrote on history, astrology, orthography, rhetoric, and poetry; and at the request of Ceolwulph, king of Northumbria, he wrote his Ecclesiastical History, an invaluable treasure, as without it we should be absolutely ignorant as to the beginnings of the Church among the Anglo-Saxons. Of still greater value was the translation which he made into his native English of parts of the New Testament, and his comments upon them. The story of his death, just after the conclusion of the translation of the Gospel of St. John, is well known. The Ecclesiastical History, which contrasts wonderfully with other similar works of the same period, was translated into English by King Alfred, and may be thoroughly relied upon where the matters which it relates fell within the cognisance of the writer. He died in 735. "It is impossible," says Professor Stubbs, "to read the more popular writings of Bede, especially the Ecclesiastical History, without seeing that the great knowledge of the scholar was coupled with the humility and simplicity of the purest type of monasticism. Employed on a theme which, in the prevailing belief of miraculous stories, could scarcely be treated of without incurring the charge of superstition, he is eminently truthful. The wonders that he relates on his own account are easily referred to very conceivable natural causes, and scarcely in any case is a reputed miracle recounted without an authority."—Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, Art. "Beda."

CHAPTER III.

THE PLANTING OF THE CHURCH IN NORTHUMBRIA.

604-655.

1. Laurentius, second Archbishop, endeavours to conciliate the British, Scotch, and Irish. 2. Mellitus, bishop of London, attends a Roman Synod. 3. Mellitus and Justus retire to France. 4. The vision of Laurentius and the conversion of Eadbald. 5. Mellitus Archbishop. 6. Paulinus goes to Northumbria. 7. The hesitation of Eadwin is overcome. 8. The heathen worship overthrown in Northumbria. 9. General conversion of the Northumbrians. 10. Success of Paulinus in Lindsey. 11. He consecrates Honorius Archbishop of Canterbury at Lincoln. 12. The overthrow of the Northumbrian Church. 13. Victory of Oswald, and restoration of the Faith of Christ in Northumbria. 14. St. Aidan and Oswald. 15. Final overthrow of Paganism in the North of England.

1. THE zeal and vigour which had been conspicuous in Augustine were no less remarkable in his successor Laurentius. The first important act of his primacy seems to have been a renewed attempt to bring the British and Scotch[1] bishops into conformity with the Church over which he presided. With this view he sent synodical letters in the names of himself, Mellitus, and Justus, to the British, Scotch, and Irish bishops, to the following effect: "To our most dear brothers the lords bishops or abbots throughout all Scotland, Laurentius, Mellitus, and Justus, servants of the servants of God. When the Apostolic See, according to the universal custom which it has followed elsewhere,

[1] The Church of the Scots and Picts having received the Faith from St. Ninian and British missionaries, naturally followed the traditions of the British Church. The Irish Church, in like manner, had been founded by Patrick, a Briton, and had in turn sent missionaries (as St. Columba) to Scotland. All these Churches were therefore agreed in holding peculiar customs as to Easter, baptism, the tonsure. The term *Universa Scotia* includes Ireland.

sent us to these western parts to preach to pagan nations, we came into this island which is called Britain without having any previous knowledge of its inhabitants. We held both the Britons and Scots in great esteem for sanctity, believing that they had proceeded according to the custom of the universal Church; but coming acquainted with the errors of the Britons, we thought the Scots had been better, until we were informed by Bishop Dagan, coming into this aforesaid island, and the Abbot Columbanus in France, that the Scots in no way differ from the Britons in their behaviour; for Bishop Dagan, coming to us, not only refused to eat with us, but even to take his repast in the same house wherein we were entertained."[1] Another letter was also addressed by the same bishops to the priests among these nations. Neither of the epistles appears to have had any success.

2. It was natural that a close intercourse should be kept up by those who had come forth from Rome with their mother Church. Hence we find Mellitus, Bishop of London, present at a Synod in Rome, in 610, and taking part in the proceedings. On the conclusion of the Synod, he brought back with him to England copies of the decrees and letters from the Pope (Boniface IV.) to Laurentius and Ethelbert.[2]

3. All went well with the newly-planted Church in England, until the death of Ethelbert, king of Kent, who finished a reign of 56 years on February 21, 616. His queen, Bertha, had died previously. Ethelbert had been a staunch defender and a munificent supporter of the Church; but his successor, Eadbald, refused to adopt the Christian faith, and scandalised all good Christians in his dominions by marrying his father's widow. Shortly after Ethelbert died his nephew, Sebert, king of the East Saxons, whose sons in like manner were pagans. There was now no Christian prince left in England, and the Church was in sore danger. Mellitus was first expelled out of London, and coming to confer with his fellow bishops in Kent, it was determined that both he and Justus should retire to France, whither Laurentius, the primate, designed soon to follow them.

[1] Bede, ii. 4. [2] *Ib., u.s.*

4. On the last night of his intended sojourn in England, Laurentius caused his bed to be laid within the Church of St. Peter and Paul. Perhaps still uncertain as to his line of duty, he expected and desired some revelation of the Divine will, by way of a vision. If so, his desire was not disappointed, for it seemed to him in his sleep as if St. Peter appeared to him, and severely scourged him for meditating this desertion of his post. It is probable that through this vivid dream the bishop perceived a method of influencing the king, and that he either himself inflicted, or caused some one to inflict, stripes upon him, the marks of which he might show to the king.[1] Upon seeing the scars, Eadbald was much astonished, and asked who had ventured thus to assault so great a man. Laurentius replied that the stripes were inflicted by the great Apostle of Christ. Struck with amazement, the king determined to abjure idols, abandon his incestuous marriage, and to be baptized. He became a zealous promoter of Christianity; recalled Mellitus and Justus; and carried on with vigour the church-building which had been begun by Ethelbert.[2]

5. In the year 619 died Laurentius, the second Archbishop of Canterbury, and was succeeded by Mellitus, who had been unable to induce the East Saxons to allow him to return to his See of London. Justus had been allowed by the now Christian king Eadbald to return to Rochester. Of the primacy of Mellitus, the only thing recorded by Bede is the sudden stoppage of a conflagration which threatened to destroy the whole city of Canterbury, by the efficacy, as it was thought, of his prayer. He died in the year 624, and was buried, like his predecessors, in the church of the monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul.

6. Mellitus was succeeded by Justus, who left his See of Rochester for the more important post of Canterbury. His primacy was destined to witness a large extension of

[1] Perhaps a more probable explanation is that some Christian monk or priest personated St. Peter, and actually scourged the Archbishop.

[2] Bede, ii. 6. He built the church of St. Mary in Canterbury, afterwards annexed to the Abbey Church, and known as the Church *in Cryptis*.—Thomas de Elmham, p. 144.

the Church in England. Pope Boniface sent to Justus the pall with his license to consecrate bishops, and acting on this he consecrated Romanus to succeed him in the See of Rochester.[1] More important events soon followed. Eadwin, king of the Northumbrian Angles, had now risen into the position of Bretwalda, by his victories over the Britons, and his conquest of the Mevanian Islands.[2] Desirous to strengthen his rising power by alliances, he had demanded of Eadbald, king of Kent, the hand of his sister Ethelburga, but had been answered: "It is not lawful to marry a Christian virgin to a pagan husband; but the faith and mysteries of the heavenly King should be profaned by her cohabiting with a king that was altogether a stranger to the worship of the true God."[3] Eadwin, on receiving this answer, offered to guarantee to his bride the fullest freedom for her worship, and to allow her to bring any Christian companions with her. He held out also a hope of his embracing the Christian religion himself. Upon this Paulinus, one of the second band of Roman missionaries, who had been labouring for twenty-four years as a priest in Kent, was consecrated bishop, and sent to accompany Ethelburga to her northern home (July 625). He made but little progress until, on the night before Easter Sunday (626), King Eadwin was wondrously saved from the dagger of an assassin by the devotion of his minister Lilla, who received the blow in his own body; and on the same night Queen Ethelburga was safely delivered of a daughter. Eadwin's heart was softened towards Paulinus, to whose prayers he attributed the safe deliverance of the queen, and he vowed that, if he returned safe and victorious from his wars with the West Saxons, he would cast off idols and serve Christ. Meantime he gave his infant daughter to the bishop for baptism, and twelve of his household were also baptized.

7. But the king himself, though crowned with victory, still hesitated about baptism, though he had abjured his idols. "He was a man," says Bede, "of extraordinary sagacity; and he sat alone by himself a long time silent as to his tongue, but deliberating in his heart how he should

[1] Bede, ii. 8. [2] *i.e.* Anglesea and Man. [3] Bede, ii. 9.

proceed, and which religion he should adhere to."[1] Letters addressed to him by the Pope (Boniface V.), pointing out to him the vanity of the heathen rites had failed to determine his decision. The entreaties of his young wife Ethelburga equally fell short of persuading him. It was then that Paulinus, becoming acquainted with a strange passage in the king's early life,[2] was able to bring an effective influence to bear upon him. For Eadwin, in his early days, when in exile in the kingdom of Redwald, king of the East Angles, and in utter despair of escaping from the cruelty of Ethelfrid, king of Northumbria, had seen in a vision an aged man, who assured him of future safety, and placing his hand upon his head, had bidden him to remember that sign. Soon after this Redwald defeated Ethelfrid, and slew him, and Eadwin was raised to the throne of Northumbria. Paulinus, becoming acquainted with this, came to the king in one of his periods of solitary meditation, and, placing his hand upon his head, asked him if he "remembered that sign." Eadwin, struck with amazement, fell down at the bishop's feet. Paulinus raised him up, and bade him no longer delay that which he was doubting about, but receive the faith, and save his soul.[3]

8. But King Eadwin would not cast off the faith of his forefathers without solemn conference with his principal friends and counsellors. At York, the chief men of the nation met to deliberate. Coifi, the high priest of the faith of Woden and Thor, took the lead in declaring that he had become persuaded that the gods whom he served were worthless, for they did nothing more for him than for others, though he expended so much pains upon them. Another of the king's chief men illustrated the pitiable ignorance of man as to his after destiny by the beautiful apologue of a bird flying out of the dark cold night into the light and warmth of a banqueting room, and passing swiftly through into the outside darkness once more. So dark, he said, was man's mind, both as to what he was be-

[1] Bede, *u.s.*

[2] Bede's words are: "As we may suppose, it was shown him in spirit." It is probable that the king had not been entirely silent as to this vision, and Paulinus may have heard of it from the relation of others.

[3] Bede, ii. 12.

fore, and what he will be after the short brightness of life. Then Paulinus took the word, and spoke of the glories of the world to come. Coifi, the priest, declared that if the religion of the Christians could give these, it was indeed worth accepting. "Let us up," he said, "O king, and destroy the images and temples of these worthless gods." "But who," said the king, "will venture to commence the work?" "Who can do this so fitly as myself," said Coifi, "who have served them more than other men?" So, mounted on a stallion, girt with a sword, and with a spear in his hand,[1] the chief priest of the heathen rites made assault upon the famous temple of Godmundigham. The spear was cast against it, the gods publicly insulted, and no vengeance lighted upon the daring priest. Then the people, gathering courage, rushed in a tumultuous band upon the temples and idols of the heathen gods, overthrew and destroyed them; and thus was Northumbria purged of the worship of the false gods.[2]

9. King Eadwin, with all the nobility of the nation, and a large number of the common sort, received the faith and the washing of regeneration at Easter-eve (April 11, 627). They were baptized at York in a little wooden church, which had been hastily erected and dedicated to St. Peter the Apostle,[3] the first germ of the glorious pile of York Minster. A nobler church of stone was immediately begun, intended to enclose the little wooden baptistery; and here, in his capital city, in imitation of what had been done in Kent, King Eadwin fixed the See of his instructor, Paulinus, who thus became the first Archbishop of York. King Eadwin's sons by a former marriage, Orfrid and Eadfrid, were baptized, as were all his children by Ethelburga; and "so great was the fervour of the faith, and the desire of the washing of salvation among the nation of the Northumbrians, that Paulinus, at a certain time, coming with the king and queen to the royal country-seat, which is called Adgelsin, stayed there with them thirty-six days,

[1] "It was not lawful for the high priest either to carry arms, or to ride on any but a mare."—Bede, ii. 13. [2] Bede, ii. 13.

[3] Nennius (*Hist. Brit.*) says that 12,000 people were baptized on the the same day as Eadwin.

fully occupied in catechising and baptizing; during which days, from morning to night, he did nothing else but instruct the people, resorting from all villages and places, in Christ's saving Word; and when instructed, he washed them with the water of absolution in the river Glen, which is close by."[1] This was in the northern part of the kingdom of Eadwin (Bernicia); but in the southern part (Deira) the work went on with equal success. Great numbers were baptized in the river Swale, which runs by the village Cataract; and on the plain of the Don a church was built, which was afterwards burnt in the unhappy wars with the infidels.[2]

10. But the labours of the great missionary Paulinus were not confined to the kingdom of the Northumbrians. He crossed the Humber, and made his way into Mercia, preaching the gospel with great success in the district of Lindissa, or Lindsey. Advancing southwards to the Roman town of Lindum-Colonia, he converted to the faith Blecca, the ealdorman, and all his household; and not far from the famous Roman arch of Trajan, and close under the Roman enclosure of the camp or castle, he built a little stone church of noble workmanship, which was afterwards made famous as the place of consecration of the fifth Archbishop of Canterbury.[3] The ministrations of Paulinus in Lindsey were not confined to Lincoln. Leaving the neighbourhood of the Witham, he proceeded to the grandly-flowing Trent, and there, at a place called by Bede Tiovulfingacestir, which has been identified as the modern Torksey, and is about the nearest point of the Trent to Lincoln, were baptized, in the presence of King Eadwin, a vast number of people by Paulinus, assisted by James the deacon. Thus was the Church first planted in Mercia.[4]

[1] Bede, iii. 14. The village of Yevering, under the Cheviots. "Another place in the same district preserves the tradition of a similar visit in its name of Pallinsburn." Bright, p. 120.

[2] The village is Catterick or Catterick-Bridge. The place of the Church perhaps, Almonbury, *i.e.* Albansbury, the town of St. Alban, to whom the church was dedicated. According to others, Doncaster.

[3] This church still survives under the name of St. Paul's. The Norman castle is built over much ancient Roman work.

[4] Bede, ii. 16. Paulinus is described by Bede as "tall of stature,

11. It was while Paulinus was thus employed that Archbishop Justus died, and the clergy of Canterbury having chosen Honorius to be his successor, he came to Paulinus at Lincoln, and was there consecrated by him, in the stone church which Paulinus had raised, fifth Archbishop of Canterbury (627). To both these prelates, one of whom was destined to preside over the Northern, the other over the Southern province, the Bishop of Rome, Honorius, sent palls. These were accompanied by encouraging letters addressed to Eadwin, and a letter to Honorius, directing that when either of the two Metropolitans deceased, the survivor should consecrate a successor without waiting to apply to Rome. The difficulty which stood in the way of appointing a Bishop of London had thus caused Gregory's original arrangement to be abandoned. Canterbury was to be definitely accepted in place of London, but York and Canterbury seem to be still placed on the same footing, the senior of them to be the Primate.[1]

12. But now a terrible calamity overtook the Church planted in northern England. For six years King Eadwin had zealously forwarded the work of spreading the gospel, and great advances had been made, both in his own dominions, and in those of his neighbours. Probably Penda, the tributary king of Mercia, foresaw that if Christianity spread among his subjects, his power would soon vanish, for he was resolutely attached to heathenism. Joining, therefore, with Cadwallader, king of the Western Britons, he led his forces against King Eadwin, and defeated him with great slaughter at Hatfield (633). Eadwin was killed, and all his army was dispersed, and the Northumbrian and Mercian Christians were given over to the savage violence of the heathen conqueror and his not less ferocious Christian ally; for, says Bede, "The Britons to this day pay no respect to the faith and religion of the English, nor correspond with them any more than with Pagans."[2] Thus the Church, which had scarcely

a little stooping, his hair black, his visage meagre, his nose slender and aquiline, his aspect both venerable and majestic."

[1] Bede, ii. 17, 18.

[2] *Ib.*, ii. 20.

taken root, was completely overthrown in Northumbria. The queen, Ethelburga, attended by Paulinus, escaped by sea into Kent, and some of the rich church furniture, given by the zeal of Eadwin, was conveyed to Canterbury. But the work of Paulinus seemed to be hopelessly ruined. He, himself, reaching Kent, found an asylum in the church of Rochester, whose bishop, Romanus, had been drowned.[1] The See was committed to him by Honorius and Eadbald, and here he continued to labour till his death (643).[2]

13. At York, Paulinus had left in charge James the deacon, who laboured assiduously to prevent the extinction of the faith. The village of *Akeburg* bears witness by its name to his presence and work there. Yet, for a short space, all was dark and apparently hopeless for the Christian cause in Northumbria. The banished son and nephew of Ethelfrid succeeded to the rule,—one of Bernicia, the other of Deira; and, though both of them had professed Christianity while in exile among the Scots, both renounced it on their accession to power. But the war with Cadwallader, the British king, not being terminated by the death of Eadwin, both the renegades, Osric and Eanfrid, were slain by this fierce warrior, who oppressed Northumbria for a year. Then Oswald, brother of Eanfrid, and son of Ethelfrid, rallied the Christians of Northumbria, and, attacking the British king with a very small force, overthrew and slew him at Dilston (634).[3] Oswald had raised the sign of the Holy Cross before engaging, and had joined with his soldiers in prayers to Heaven; for which cause the place was afterwards called "the Heavenly Field," and many miracles are said to have been done there; and before that time there was "no sign of the Christian faith, no Church, no altar, throughout all the nation of the Bernicians."[4]

14. Oswald united the claims of both Osric and Eanfrid, and reigned over the two provinces of Northumbria. He had learned Christianity when in exile in Scotland from the disciples of St. Columba, the Irish missionary, who had established a religious centre at the little island of

[1] Thomas de Elmham, p. 173. [2] Bede, *u.s.*
[3] *Ib.*, iii. 1. [4] *Ib.*, iii. 2.

Hy or Iona.[1] Consequently, when he desired to restore the faith in his kingdom, he did not send for Paulinus, but sought teachers from the place which he had learned specially to revere. They sent to him Bishop Aidan, "a man of singular meekness, piety, and moderation, zealous in the cause of God,"[2] although he did hold that Easter Sunday might fall on the fourteenth of the month, and differ from the Roman use as to the tonsure and the use of the chrism in baptism. To him the king assigned, as an abode and See, not the church of York, which Eadwin had begun, but the quasi-island of Lindisfarne, where he built a religious house. He seconded Aidan's work with the greatest zeal, and it "was delightful to see," says Bede, "the king himself interpreting the Word of God to his commanders and ministers, for he had perfectly learned the language of the Scots during his long banishment."[3] Under the fostering care of Oswald, the Church rapidly grew in Northumbria. The teachers who came from Scotland practised the regular discipline, and lived in community. Money and lands were freely given by the king to found monasteries, and the zeal and devotion of Aidan inspired all around him.

15. But in the ninth year of his reign King Oswald was overthrown and slain at Maserfield by the same ruthless Pagan chieftain, Penda, the king of the Mercians, who had slain King Eadwin (642). He was succeeded by Oswy, his brother, who continued to uphold the Church, but not with the same pure devotion as Oswald had done, for he cruelly put to death Oswin, of the race of Eadwin, who had obtained the government of Deira, and was distinguished for his devotion and humility.[4] Twelve days after Oswin, whom he greatly loved, Bishop Aidan himself was taken to his rest. King Oswy, being driven to desperation by the exactions of Penda, king of the Mercians, determined to engage him, though but with a small army. Before the

[1] For an account of St. Columba see Notes and Illustrations.

[2] Bede, iii. 3. It is well to observe that Bede, although he holds the British customs to be such great enormities, nevertheless does not stint his praise for true British saints such as was St. Aidan.

[3] *Ib.*, iii. 3. [4] *Ib.*, iii. 14.

battle he vowed his infant daughter to a religious life if he should be successful. He completely triumphed over the pagan forces at Wingfield (655), and having "cut off the wicked king's head, converted the Mercians and the adjacent provinces to the grace of the Christian faith."[1] Thus the Christian faith was again firmly planted in Northumbria. "The battle of Wingfield," says Mr. Freeman, "is a name which is obscure as it now stands, but it marks an important turning-point in the history of our island. The strife between the creeds of Christ and Woden was there finally decided; the Mercians embraced the religion of their neighbours, and Northumberland again became the leading power of Britain."[2] It will now be necessary to revert to other of the Teutonic kingdoms, and to see how the Church took root in them also.

[1] Bede, iii. 24. There is a curious confusion in Bede's statements as to King Penda. In c. 21 he represents him as not opposed to the Christian religion, though himself a pagan, and as allowing his son to marry a Christian princess. In c. 24 he is described as a ferocious pagan, who was bent on exterminating the Northumbrians, and his death is said to be the means of opening Mercia to the faith.

[2] *Norman Conquest*, i. 37.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

ST. COLUMBA.

In the case of all the earlier apostles of Christianity we have to contend with legend and manifest exaggeration in trying to obtain a knowledge of their true history. Columba is said to have been born at Gartan, in Donegal, about the year 521. He belonged to a chieftain's family, and was able to found several monasteries. His clan being involved in a quarrel with King Diarmaid, on account of an insult offered to him, Columba, penitent for the blood shed on his account, determined to go on a Christian mission to Scotland. In 563 he embarked in an open boat covered with skins, and on Whitsunday eve landed on a little island known by the name of Hy (Island), and afterwards softened into Iona. Columba obtained a grant of this island from the chief of Argyleshire, who was of Irish blood, and proceeded to erect a monastery there, the buildings being of the simplest description. The first monks were all Irish, but British and even Saxons came to join them. Columba was remarkable for his assiduous study of Holy Scripture, and the monks were employed in learning the Psalter by heart and transcribing the lives of saints. They were also diligently engaged in out-of-door occupations needed for their support. The settlement, chiefly owing to the great qualities of its head, became immensely popular, and speedily sent off offshoots into the neighbouring district. Columba himself went on a mission to the Picts, and carried the gospel to the Orkneys and Hebrides. He visited Ireland, and took a leading part in a council held there, and then returned to his Scotch home. A continued progress in influence and usefulness attended his work. He caused larger and stronger boats to be constructed, and was constantly employed in visiting, supervising, and directing the many monasteries among the islands and on the coast in the west of Scotland which he had founded. At length, at a great age, on the morning of Sunday, June 9, A.D. 597, this holy and most successful pioneer of Christianity departed to his rest. "On the Saturday afternoon he was transcribing the thirty-fourth Psalm (Ps. xxxiii. E. V.), and coming to the verse, 'They who seek the Lord shall want no manner of thing that is good,' he said, 'Here I must stop, at the end of this page; what follows let Baithen write.' He then left his cell to attend Vespers, and returning at the close, lay down on his couch of stone and gave his last injunctions to Baithen, till the bell at midnight called them to the nocturnal office. St. Columba was the first to enter the oratory, and when the brethren followed with lights, they found the saint prostrate before the altar, and he soon passed away with a sweet smile on his face, as though he had merely fallen into a gentle sleep." — Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, Article "Columba."

CHAPTER IV.

PLANTING OF THE CHURCH IN THE OTHER ENGLISH KINGDOMS—THE CONFERENCE AT WHITBY.

632-664.

1. Conversion of the East Angles. 2. Conversion of the West Saxons. 3. The See transferred to Winchester. 4. Leutherius made Bishop of the West Saxons. 5. Establishment of the Church in Mercia. 6. Chad, Bishop of Lichfield. 7. Cedd reconverts the East Saxons—becomes second bishop of London. 8. Which parts of the land were converted from Roman, and which from British sources. 9. The two Uses must needs collide. 10. Their Collision in Northumbria. 11. The Conference at Whitby. 12. Effects of the Whitby Conference.

1. FIVE years after the baptism of Eadwin, king of Northumbria, was baptized Eorpwald, king of the East Angles[1] (632). His father Redwald, who had entertained Eadwin of Northumbria during his banishment, had been baptized formerly in Kent; but either mistaking Augustine's ruling as to the heathen temples and worship, or still adhering in his heart to his old faith,[2] had endeavoured to unite in the same church the worship of Christ and the false gods. His son Eorpwald was more thorough-going in his acceptance of the truth, but very soon after his conversion he was slain. Then after three years of anarchy, Sigbercht, brother to Eorpwald, obtained the rule of East Anglia, and being a "most Christian and learned man," applied himself earnestly to the

[1] A.-S. Chronicle; but other authorities place the conversion of Eorpwald in 627 or 628. See Smith on Bede, ii. 15.

[2] Bede says, "Seduced by his wife and certain false teachers." It is evident, however, that Redwald did not completely apostatise from Christianity, but made an attempt at combination. This *may* have proceeded from the views set forth by Gregory as to the heathen temples.

planting of the Church there. Sigbercht had, during a period of banishment, lived in France, and there had become fully instructed in the Christian faith. It was natural for him, when he reached power, to seek instruction for his people in the same quarter where he himself had found it. Accordingly, Felix, a Burgundian bishop, was, with the consent of the primate Honorius, appointed to superintend the missionary work among the East Angles. His success was great. His See was established in the city of Dunwich, in Suffolk, which has thus the original of that which many centuries afterwards became the See of Norwich.[1]

2. A more important conversion than even that of East Anglia, inasmuch as the tribe was more aggressive and played a greater part in the subsequent history of the land, was that of the West Saxons, or the kingdom of Wessex. Wessex occupied a large and fertile part of the south of England, having access both to the Southern Sea and to the estuary of the Severn, but during its earlier days it was not able to cope with the power of the northern princes. Five of its kings fell in battle against Eadwin, and Penda, the heathen king of Mercia, took away a large district from it.[2] The gospel was first preached to the West Saxons by Birinus, a missionary from Rome, who undertook to Pope Honorius to sow the seed of the holy faith where no other teacher had been before him. He received episcopal consecration from Asterius, bishop of Genoa, and started on his mission. He found the West Saxons utterly heathen, and commenced his work among them (634). The king himself, Cynegilsus, was disposed to receive the faith, perhaps from the knowledge of the fact that the most powerful princes of the land had already

[1] Bede, ii. 16. Herbert of Losinga, in the time of William Rufus, moved the See, then at Thetford, to Norwich, and built the cathedral. Before that time Dunwich had been united to Elmham, the other East Anglian See, and the bishop of the East Angles was Bishop of Elmham. This was Stigand's title in the time of Edward the Confessor. Then followed the movement of the See to Thetford, six years after the Conquest, and soon afterwards to Norwich. Dunwich has long since disappeared beneath the sea. See Thomas de Elmham, p. 167.

[2] Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, i. 36.

become Christian. He was also without doubt influenced by Oswald, the Bretwalda, king of the Northumbrians, who was then in his territories seeking his daughter in marriage. He was baptized in the presence of Oswald, and the people, as they universally did, following in great numbers the example of their king, Birinus was able to see speedy fruit of his labours (635). Cynegilsus, with the consent of Oswald, gave him the city of Dorchester in which to establish his See, and here he built a church and ended his days.[1]

3. In the year 643 (or 642[2]) Coinwalch or Kenwealh succeeded to the kingdom of the West Saxons. He soon began to take steps for abandoning Dorchester, probably as being too near the borders of the Mercian kingdom, and for transferring the See to Winchester,[3] where a church and monastery were built and hallowed in the name of St. Peter.[4] In the year 650, Birinus being dead, Agilbert, a Frenchman, succeeded him as bishop of Dorchester, with the charge of the whole of the West Saxons. King Kenwealh, "grown weary of this bishop's barbarous tongue,"[5] brought another bishop into his dominions, Wini, a Saxon by birth, and desired to divide his territory between them. At this Agilbert took offence and returned into France, and Wini was made the first bishop of Winchester, the country being divided between that See and Sherborne.

4. It does not indeed appear that a bishop of Sherborne was appointed at this time, for Bede says that Wini being soon afterwards expelled from his bishopric,[6] took refuge with Wulfere, king of the Mercians, and thus the province of the West Saxons continued no small time without a bishop. During this period King Kenwealh suffered many defeats, and his conscience suggested to him that perhaps his misfortunes were due to his neglect of the spiritual

[1] Bede, iii. 71. A.-S. Chron. [2] A.-S. Chron.

[3] Kenwealh was involved in war with Penda, king of the Mercians, and driven into exile by him. Bede says that it was in his exile among the East Angles that he became a Christian. [4] A.-S. Chron.

[5] Bede. The Winchester Annals speak of Agilbert as flying away because of the king's resolve to transfer the See to Winchester.—*Ann. Monast.* ii. 4. [6] He held the bishopric three years.—*A.-S. Chron.*

interests of his kingdom. Accordingly, he sent messages to Agilbert in France, desiring him to return. Agilbert declined to do this, having become bishop of Paris, but he sent in his stead Leutherius, his nephew, whom he declared to be worthy of a bishopric. The king and people received him honourably; and at their request, Theodore, then Archbishop of Canterbury, consecrated him bishop. For many years he zealously administered the whole bishopric of the West Saxons.[1]

5. From the settlement of the Church among the East Anglians and West Saxons we pass to its commencement in the powerful kingdom of Mercia. The work of Paulinus in converting the Mercians, or at least the people of Lindsey, during the time of Eadwin,[2] has been already spoken of. The power and violence of the heathen king Penda probably soon effaced the work of Paulinus, and up to the year 652 Mercia remained almost entirely heathen. In that year,[3] or the following, Peada, the son of Penda, having been made by his father chief or ealdorman of the Mid-Angles, desired of Oswy, king of Northumbria, the gift of his daughter Alhfleda. But he could not obtain his desire unless he would "embrace the faith of Christ and be baptized with the nation which he governed."[4] He consented to be instructed, and was baptized by St. Finan. He then returned to Mid-Anglia with his bride and with four priests—Cedda, Adda, Betti, and Diuma—who preached the gospel in Mercia, and were willingly listened to. King Penda himself did not oppose the preaching of the Word in Mercia, but was only particularly severe on those who did not live up to their Christian profession. But Penda was soon involved in war with Oswy, king of Northumbria, and at the battle of Wingfield (655) was slain, so that now there was nothing to hinder the establishment of the Church in Mercia.

6. Diuma, one of the priests who had come with Peada from Northumbria, was made bishop of the Lindisfaras and

[1] Bede, iii. 7. The A.-S. Chron. says that he succeeded to the See 670, and held it seven years. He probably resided at Dorchester, as he is not mentioned by the Winchester Annalist.

[2] Between 627 and 633. [3] A.-S. Chron. [4] Bede, iii. 21.

Mid-Angles. His See probably had no fixed headquarters. He was rather in the position of a missionary bishop. To Diuma, who died at Repton, succeeded Cellah, who quitted his Episcopal office and retired to Scotland. To Cellah succeeded Trumhere, an English abbot; to Trumhere, Jaruman; and to Jaruman, Ceadda. Ceadda was one of four brothers who are mentioned by Bede as all having entered the priesthood, and all laboured as missionaries. One of them, probably the eldest, Cedda, was one of the four priests who came with Peada. Of Ceadda (better known as Chad) it will be necessary to speak again in giving the history of Wilfrid. He was consecrated by Wini, bishop of Winchester, and occupied the See of York for three years. He then gave way to Wilfrid, and was made bishop of Mercia, being reconsecrated on account of a canonical defect by Archbishop Theodore (669), and settled at Lichfield.[1]

7. In the meantime Cedd, the brother of Chad, had done a great work in restoring the Church among the East Saxons. After the happy commencement made by Mellitus at the beginning of the century, under the patronage of King Sebert, Christianity had, on the death of Sebert, been completely overthrown in the kingdom of the East Saxons. It was now reintroduced by the persuasion and influence of Oswy, king of Northumbria. The East Saxon king Sigebert was on friendly terms with the Bretwalda, and often came into Northumbria. Here Oswy endeavoured to convince him that those could be no gods which were made with hands; that God is of incomprehensible majesty and greatness. After many conversations of this sort Sigebert consented to be baptized, and he and his chief men were admitted into the Church by Bishop Finan. Then Sigebert asked Oswy to give him some teachers to instruct his people, and the Northumbrian prince, knowing the value of Cedd, who was then employed in ministering to the Mid-Angles, sent him and another priest to instruct the people of Sigebert. After labouring some time Cedd repaired to St. Finan, and by him was

[1] Bede, iv. 2, 3. He had been consecrated to a See not in reality vacant, as Wilfrid was merely absent, but was rightly bishop.

consecrated bishop, thus becoming (after an interval of forty years) the second bishop of London (654).

8. Thus, with the exception of the South Saxons, the Church was planted in all the English kingdoms, and in the majority of cases not by the action of Roman clergy, but by missionaries deriving their commission from Scotch or Irish—that is, from ancient British sources. The Scots and Irish owed their conversion to British missionaries, and thus repaid their obligations by converting the heathen conquerors of that land. This will appear clearer if we pass in review the special cases of each of the English kingdoms. Northumbria, the most important during this era, as being the seat of three successive Bretwaldas, though originally converted partially by Paulinus the Roman, yet without doubt owed its complete conversion to the labours of St. Aidan and St. Finan, who came from the Scoto-British settlement of Iona. From Northumbria East Anglia received the gospel, and its conversion was due partly to the Burgundian Felix, but probably more to the Irish monk Fursey and his companions. The important kingdom of Mercia, comprising all the central parts of the country, received its entire Christian organisation from Scoto-British sources. Among the East Saxons, Christianity, first planted from a Roman source, had been entirely wiped out, but was restored by Cedda, the disciple of St. Finan. There remains only Kent, which had been Christianised from Rome, and the kingdom of the West Saxons, where the Church had been planted by the Roman missionary Birinus.

9. The differences between the form of Christianity derived from Rome, and that derived from Iona, were mainly external, and chiefly these three—viz. a difference as to the computation of Easter ; a difference as to the method of making the tonsure ; and a difference as to the rites to be observed at baptism. The Roman party regarded their customs with reverence as being derived from the centre of Western Christendom, and supported by the consent of the Catholic Church. The British party were no less fondly attached to their practices, as being handed down to them, as they held, from primitive tradition, and hallowed by the sufferings through which their

Church had passed. It was evident that the two habits of church life could not co-exist together in friendly fashion; one or other must yield if there was to be anything like unity in the religion of the various portions of the island. The two forms or uses first met and came into direct collision in the court of Oswy, king of Northumbria.

10. Oswy had married a Kentish princess, Eanfleda, who kept the Roman use, while the king himself, who had been taught by the Scotch clergy, was an observer of their rules. Oswy's son, Alchfrid, had been instructed by Wilfrid, a young man of great talent, who had studied at Rome and at Lyons, and of course upheld the Roman methods. The controversies therefore which arose in the royal family on these points were constant. Sometimes it would happen that the king and the British priests were celebrating Easter, while the Queen and the Romans were still keeping Lent. But while St. Aidan and St. Finan lived, so great was the reverence which they inspired that no change was attempted. When Finan died and Colman came in his place to Lindisfarne, the Roman party were able to induce the king to order a solemn conference to be held on the disputed points.

11. The place chosen for this was Strenæshalch or Whitby, where Hilda, a woman devoted to God, had founded monastic houses for monks and nuns.[1] In the year 664 assembled at Whitby King Oswy and his son Alchfrid; on the British side Colman the bishop with his Scotch clerks, the abbess Hilda and her attendants, Cedd, bishop of the East Saxons; on the Roman, Agilbert, bishop of the West Saxons, the priests Agatho and Wilfrid; James, who had been deacon to Paulinus, and Romanus, the queen's chaplain. The two parties were thus each well represented, but the discussion was confined to Wilfrid on the Roman side and Colman for the national party. As to the time for the observance of Easter, Colman declared that the keeping the festival on the fourteenth day of the month, was a tradition which had been

[1] For an account of Hilda and of Cædmon, the famous poetical monk of Whitby, see Notes and Illustrations to this chapter.

handed down from St. John the Evangelist, and used by all the churches in which he presided. Wilfrid urged against this that the custom observed by St. John was in deference to the Jewish Christians, as St. Paul had circumcised Timothy; but was not intended, any more than circumcision, to be perpetual. But Peter, when he preached at Rome, gave directions that Easter should always be kept on the Sunday, and that that Sunday should be chosen which fell first after the evening of the fourteenth day. But, said Wilfrid, you do not follow the custom of St. John, as you too always observe Easter on Sunday, only you begin your calculation wrongly, making it possible to fall upon the fourteenth, whereas the fourteenth should be excluded. Then Colman alleged the practice of Anatolius and St. Columba. Wilfrid denied that Anatolius supported their view, and as to St. Columba, though he may have been a good man, he acted in this with "rustic simplicity," and his authority was not to be compared to that of St. Peter, who kept the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Upon hearing this King Oswy exclaimed, "Is it true, O Colman, that St. Peter keeps the keys?" Colman replied, "It is true, O king." Then said the king, "I will not contradict him, lest when I come to the gates of the kingdom he should refuse to open." And so the controversy was determined in favour of the Roman use.[1]

12. It is said by Bede that besides the dispute about Easter, "there was much controversy at Whitby about the tonsure," and this too was determined to be after the Roman fashion, that is to say in a complete circle, and not in the crescent shape adopted by the British Churches. As to the other disputed point—the use of the chrism in baptism—it is not said that any question arose. The immediate effect of the conference was that Colman retired to Scotland in disgust, and was succeeded as bishop of Lindisfarne by Tuda, who had been educated and ordained among the Southern Scots, the church of St. Ninian, which observed the Roman rites. Bishop

[1] Bede, iii. 25. See for the Easter Controversy, Notes and Illustrations to Chapter I. (B).

Cedd, on the contrary, submitted to the decision of the Conference, abandoned the national customs, and accepted those of Rome.[1] The ultimate effect of the meeting at Whitby was to settle for the whole Church of England a conformity to the Church of Rome, and thus to pave the way for the work of the great prelate who was soon to succeed, and whose mission it was to constitute the churches of the various kingdoms into one great national church—the Church of England.

[1] Bede, iii. 26. It should be observed that the decision arrived at at Whitby was the act of an independent National Synod, and in no way dictated or even influenced from Rome.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A) THE EARLY MONASTERIES OF ENGLAND.

Houses for "common life," guided more or less by "rules," may be regarded as having been an absolute necessity for the establishment of Christianity among wild and unsettled races. Thus the earlier Christianity, both of the British and English type, led to the founding of monasteries. Of the more famous British monasteries, the oldest (according to William of Malmesbury) was Glastonbury, the traditions about which have been mentioned (Chap. I.) The next most famous was perhaps Bangor, in North Wales. Bangor (high circle) is a name belonging to several monasteries (Bright, *E. E. Ch. Hist.*, 29). The North Welsh Bangor is said to have numbered 2000 monks. Some writers say that Pelagius was a monk of this establishment. In Northumbria, when Aidan came from St. Columba's House of Hy, he founded Lindisfarne (635). After the battle of Wingfield (655), six religious houses were founded in Bernicia, six in Deira. Gilling, the original of Tynemouth, was founded in expiation of the murder of Oswin (651). Hilda, who founded Whitby in 657, had been previously abbess of a small nunnery near Hartlepool. At Medeshamstede (afterwards Peterboro') the first religious house of central England was founded (656). Of the earlier religious houses springing from Romano-English sources we must of course put first the two Canterbury monasteries, those of Christ Church and St. Peter and St. Paul (St. Augustine's), which may be assigned to the end of the sixth century. Afterwards, as each kingdom and district received the gospel, a religious house commenced its existence at the central spot, the See or Seat of the Bishop. Thus Dorchester and Winchester began, and Selsey was founded by Wilfrid, who had already founded many religious houses in the north. Of

religious houses which were not Cathedral centres, one of the earliest and most famous was Croyland, among the Lincolnshire Fens, which owed its origin to the hermit Guthlac, about the end of the seventh century, and Evesham, founded by Bishop Egwin about the same time. Bardney, in Lincolnshire, was also a very early Mercian house. The earlier monasteries were governed by a much less elaborate rule than that of St. Benedict, which only slowly found its way into England, and the rule of one house differed in many ways from that of another. See Article "Monasteries," *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.*

(B) THE ABBESS HILDA.

Hilda was the grand-niece of King Eadwin, the first Christian king of Northumbria. She was baptized at York by Paulinus at the age of thirteen, and desired to join her sister Hereswid in a Frankish convent, but was recalled by the summons of Bishop Aidan. She was for one year a nun in a small cell on the north of the Wear, then abbess at Hartlepool, then foundress and abbess of Whitby. She was a woman of great power as well as of great devotion. Her house consisted of monks as well as nuns, living in separate establishments. No less than five of her monks reached the episcopal dignity. The place chosen by her for her convent was called Strenæshalch, the "bay of the lighthouse." It was founded about 657, and at once attained a high reputation for sanctity and learning. Hilda died in 680, and was succeeded at Whitby by the princess-nun Elfled, who had been devoted by her father Oswy to the monastic life just after the great victory of Wingfield.

(C) THE MONK CÆDMON.

Cædmon was a cow-herd attached to Whitby monastery, noted for his stupidity, and for not being able to sing at the beer-parties of his comrades. One night he had retired in melancholy from a merry meeting, and lay down in a cattle-shed, where he had a dream that some one bade him sing of the creation, and lines seemed to be suggested to him in his dream, which in the morning he was able to remember. On this being told to the abbess Hilda, she caused a portion of Scripture to be read to him, and bade him turn it into poetry. He did so. His "gift" was admitted, and he became a monk. Many a poem did he afterwards indite on sacred subjects. He was the first poetry-writer in the English tongue, and thus the "father" of English poetry. "We are indebted to Bede for a general description of Cædmon's poems. He put into verse, among many other things, the books of Genesis and Exodus. In the New Testament he sang the chief incidents in our Lord's life, the descent of the Holy Spirit, the teaching of the Apostles. On the terrors of the coming judgment, the pains of hell, and the blessedness of heaven, he wrote numerous poems, and many on the goodness and visitations of Providence. Bede gives us a translated fragment of the poem that the new-made poet sang to the mysterious visitant who first awoke his inspiration. King Alfred, in his version of Bede, gives the words in the vernacular, and it is probable that the king is quoting Cædmon's own words. These words have been used as a test applied to other alleged poems of Cædmon, but the genuineness of these is still doubtful." — See Article "Cædmon" Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography.*

CHAPTER V.

PRIMACY OF ARCHBISHOP THEODORE.

668-709.

1. Wighard sent to Rome for consecration as archbishop. 2. Wighard dying, Theodore is consecrated in his stead. 3. Theodore visits the English Church. 4. The Council of Hertford, 673. 5. Theodore's absolute power. 6. Extirpation of the British "Uses." 7. Theodore divides the Northumbrian diocese. 8. The Mercian diocese divided into five. 9. The Council of Hatfield. 10. Cuthbert made Bishop of Lindisfarne. 11. Death and character of Theodore. 12. Earlier work of Wilfrid as bishop. 13. He appeals to Rome against Ecfrid and Theodore. 14. The decision of Rome repudiated in England — Wilfrid imprisoned. 15. Wilfrid converts the South Saxons. 16. Replaced in York—again banished—Bishop of Leicester. 17. Synod of Easterfield—Wilfrid appeals to Rome. 18. Compromise made at the Synod of the Nidd. 19. Wilfrid's death and character. 20. Commencement of the *Parochial System*. 21. Relations between State and Church. 22. Protection of the Church by the State Laws of Ina and Wihtred. 23. Attempt to persuade British Churches to abandon their uses. 24. Adhelm, first Bishop of Sherborne. 25. The missionaries Willibrord and Boniface. 26. Benedict Biscop. 27. Bede. 28. Bede's testimony against the monastic corruptions.

1. HAVING thus traced the establishment of the Church in the various kingdoms of England, we turn back to the first place of its settlement—the kingdom of Kent. Here King Eadbald, who had become a Christian under Laurentius, had died (640), and been succeeded by his son Earconbert. This prince was more zealous in upholding Christianity than his predecessors. He caused the idols throughout his dominions to be destroyed, and the fast of Lent to be generally observed. His daughter was professed as a nun in France, whither many of the noble ladies of the English race resorted to practise the religious life.[1] Under this king's fostering care the Church grew and flourished.

[1] Bede, iii. 9.

Honorius had been consecrated archbishop by Paulinus at Lincoln, and in his turn Honorius consecrated a successor in the See of Rochester to Paulinus, who, after the overthrow of the Church at York, had retired thither. Here he died in 644. It is remarkable that his successor at Rochester, Ithamar, was a man of the Kentish race, but, as Bede declares, "not inferior to his predecessors for learning and conduct of life."[1] In the year 664 there was great mortality in England.[2] Earconbert, king of Kent, and the sixth Archbishop of Canterbury, Fritonas or Deusdedit, who had followed Honorius, died on the same day (July 14). Egbercht, son of Erconwald, succeeded to the kingdom, and he, in conjunction with the Bretwalda Oswy of Northumbria, sent Wighard, a priest of the English race, to Rome to be consecrated archbishop in succession to Deusdedit.

2. At Rome, Wighard and almost all his companions were carried off by a pestilence. The Pope, Vitalian, was then requested by Oswy, in his capacity of Bretwalda, to provide a fit person for the office of archbishop.[3] He first selected Adrian, an abbot, who was well acquainted with the western parts. Adrian declined the office, and recommended as one more suited for it Andrew, a monk, who refused it on the ground of ill-health. He then suggested Theodore, a Greek monk born at Tarsus; a man famous for his learning and skill. Theodore was sixty-six years of age and a layman, but the Pope approved the choice of him for the important office of Primate of the English Church. But first it was necessary that he should wait four months in Rome for his hair to grow. According to the Eastern custom his head had been entirely shaved. It must now be shorn in a tonsure, according to the orthodox Western pat-

[1] Bede, iii. 14.

[2] Anglo-Saxon Chron., the "Yellow Pest."—See Bright, *Ch. Hist.*, 206. During the four years' vacancy of the See, it was administered, says Thomas de Elmham, by Bishop Wilfrid.—P. 193. But this does not appear compatible with the chronology of Wilfrid's life.

[3] That the English kings requested the Pope to do this, and that he did not do it independently of them, appears plainly from Vitalian's letter to Oswy.—Bede, iii. 29. See Bright, 216.

tern.[1] Theodore was consecrated March 26, 668, and about two months afterwards was sent towards England,[2] the abbot Adrian being appointed to accompany him, both as being acquainted with Western customs, and also to take care that Theodore "should not, according to the custom of the Greeks, introduce anything contrary to the faith into the church where he presided."[3] The prelate thus chosen in somewhat of a haphazard fashion, and without any previous knowledge on the part of the Pope, proved a most valuable and efficient director for the English Church.

3. His first care was to visit all the island wherever the nation of the Angles inhabited. He was, says the historian, everywhere most willingly entertained and heard by all persons, being accompanied and assisted by the abbot Adrian. Both of them dispensed freely the stores of their learning, having many disciples whom they instructed both in sacred and profane literature. Theodore was everywhere obeyed as the archbishop of the whole land. The times were happy and peaceful.[4] All men were intent upon learning the doctrines of the faith, and improving their manner of worship. Sacred music was now generally taught and practised. Theodore appointed bishops where he saw them to be most needed, and among others he reconsecrated Chad, who was removed from the See of York and made bishop of Lichfield, as has been already said.[5]

4. In the year 670 died Oswy the Bretwalda, king of the Northumbrians, and was succeeded by Ecgfrid, his son. With Oswy the ascendency of the Northumbrian kingdom expired, and Mercia now rises into pre-eminence. But it was not within the kingdom of Mercia, but at Hertford in

[1] Bede, iv. 1.

[2] Bede in this place and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle put Theodore's arrival in England in the year 668, but in the next chapter Bede says that he arrived in his see the second year after his consecration. He was detained in France from various causes. King Egbert sent his reeve Redfrid to bring him into England. He arrived and was installed at Canterbury the second Sunday after Pentecost, May 27, 669. See Bright, pp. 222-3.

[3] Bede, *ib.*

[4] *Ecclesia mirificè Sabbatizavit*, says Thomas de Elmham, p. 206.

[5] Bede, iv. 2.

the dominions of the East Saxons[1] that Theodore assembled his first council (673). At this were present Theodore, the archbishop; Bisi, bishop of the East Angles; Pulta, bishop of Rochester; Leutherius, bishop of the West Saxons; Winfrid, bishop of the Mercians; and (by his proxies) Wilfrid, bishop of the Northumbrians. The Archbishop first exhorted those present to receive all things that had been canonically decreed by the Church, and they agreed to do so. Theodore then produced a Book of Canons. I. The first of these ordained that all should keep Easter on the same day, namely the Sunday after the 14th of the first month. II. That no bishop should intrude into the diocese of another. III. That no bishop should trouble monasteries or take anything forcibly from them. IV. That monks should remain in the monastery where they have been professed. V. That priests should not wander from one diocese to another, nor be received without letters of recommendation. VI. That bishops and clergy, when travelling, should be content with the hospitality afforded them, and not exercise clerical functions without leave of the bishop where they were. VII. That a synod be held every year in July at Clovesho. VIII. That bishops should take rank according to the time and order of their consecration. IX. That additional bishops be appointed as the number of the faithful increases—no detailed proposals at present. X. That marriages be not made with those of near kindred; that divorce be only allowed for adultery; that the divorced person do not marry again. These canons were all accepted and subscribed by those present, and thus the foundation of the discipline of the English Church was laid.[2]

5. Theodore, by virtue of the deference and respect everywhere paid to him, was able to act altogether as an English pope. Soon after this Synod he deposed Winfrid, bishop of the Mercians, for "some disobedience," and in his place consecrated Saxulf. He also consecrated Earconwald to be bishop of the City of London, who obtained a

[1] On the borders of Mercia and Essex.

[2] Bede, iv. 5; Thomas de Elmham, 238; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 118, *sq.*

high reputation for sanctity. Monasteries were now everywhere springing up in the land. Earconwald before his consecration had founded a religious house of men at Chertsey, and one for women at Barking. Saxulf had been the first abbot of Medeshampstede, afterwards better known as Peterborough. In the north Lindisfarne and Whitby were already famous. In the south St. Augustine's at Canterbury, and the British founded Glastonbury. The earlier condition of the Church, before the introduction of the parochial system, was altogether monastic, a certain proportion of monasteries being as necessary to the existence of the Church in a diocese, as the bishop himself.

6. Under the vigorous administration of Archbishop Theodore that complete subjection of the English customs to those of Rome, which had been determined on at Whitby, was now carried out. The national uses had no powerful supporter, and were everywhere obliged to yield. According to the Penitential of Theodore, the bishops who had been consecrated by the Scots or Britons were not to be admitted to the offices of their function without the imposition of the hands of a Catholic bishop; chrism and the holy eucharist were permitted only to those who made profession of reuniting themselves to the Church, and those who doubted of their baptism were to be rebaptized.[1] Theodore also introduced that potent instrument of clerical power—the practice of auricular confession—which was unknown in the Church of England before his time.[2]

7. One of Archbishop Theodore's chief works was the creation and constitution of new Sees, a pressing need, as the Church in England began to expand and grow. The principle of subdivision of Sees had been affirmed by the Council of Hertford, but Theodore carried it out in a high-handed and autocratic manner which caused much heart-burning, and which brought him into collision with Wilfrid, the famous bishop of York, whose settlement in that See by Theodore's act has been already mentioned. The history of Wilfrid will be brought into a connected

[1] Theodori *Penitent.*, "De Communione Scottorum."—Thorpe's *Ancient Laws*, p. 307; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 197.

[2] *Egberti Dialogus—Eccles. Instit.*—Thorpe's *Ancient Laws.*

form subsequently; it is sufficient here to say that about the year 678, Theodore, without any consultation with him, consecrated three new bishops to act with Wilfrid in his diocese,[1] and upon his appeal to Rome against the arrangement, appointed one of these to occupy his See of York. Three years afterwards he subdivided the diocese again; made Eata bishop of Lindisfarne, Trumbercht of Hexham, and Trumwine of the Southern Picts, who had been subjected by the Northumbrian king, establishing his See at Abercorn.

8. A more important subdivision even than this was that which was made by Theodore of the great Mercian diocese, the See of which was at Lichfield. In the year (probably) 679, a partition of this was effected by Theodore into five dioceses, with the consent of a Mercian Witenagemot, viz. Lindsey, Leicester, Lichfield, Worcester, and Hereford.[2] The northern of these dioceses, that of Lindsey, a district which had been conquered and reconquered by the kings of Northumbria and Mercia, had its See at a place called by the chroniclers Siddena or Siddena Castra, which may be almost certainly identified as the modern Stow.[3] Leicester was a convenient centre for the Mid-Angles. At Lichfield Saxulf was already established, and retained his See. Worcester was the capital of the sub-kingdom of the Hwiccians, and its king, Oshere, was anxious for a bishop. At Hereford, Putta, who had been obliged to quit Rochester, was established. Thus, without any difficulty or opposition, the one huge diocese fell naturally into five, and a great accession of strength was brought to the English Church.

[1] Lindsey was just at that period under Northumbria. The three bishops were therefore Eata and Bosa for Lindisfarne, and Eathed for Lindsey. In a very short time Lindsey was reconquered by Mercia, and Eathed retired to Ripon, not, however, to act as bishop.

[2] Florence of Worcester makes Dorchester the fifth, but Dorchester was not now in Mercia. It was a part of the See of Winchester. It is probable that Bede speaks by mistake of Ætla, a bishop of Dorchester, for Heddi of Winchester, and that Florence was misled by this. See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 128, *sq.*

[3] The earliest mention of the Syddensis civitas as the seat of the Lindsey bishopric is at the Council of Clovesho, A.D. 803.—Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 547.

9. Furnished now with a respectable number of suffragans, Archbishop Theodore was able to hold a synod which should make its voice heard and respected by the whole Church. Under him the Church of England could meet, not simply to regulate its own internal discipline, but to pronounce an opinion on matters of general concernment. This was the period when one of the forms of heresy which sprang out of the great controversy on the nature of the incarnation was agitating the Church, and Monotheletism, the last wave of Eutychianism, was gaining many adherents. In the same year that the third Council of Constantinople was held, which condemned this heresy (680), there was held at Hatfield, under Archbishop Theodore, a Synod, which in like manner repudiated it, and which also formally declared the acceptance of the Church of England of the five General Councils, their canons and decrees, and that the Church of England believed as they believed, and anathematised those whom they anathematised.[1]

10. In the year 685 we find Archbishop Theodore again exercising his autocratic authority by the deposition of Trumbercht from the See of Hexham. In the same year a Synod was held at Twyford or Alnmouth, at which the Archbishop presided. It was agreed that the See of Hexham should be filled by the appointment of Cuthbert, who had been prior of Melrose, then of Lindisfarne, and now retired to live as a recluse on the little island of Farne.[2] He shrank from the responsibility of the episcopate, but at length yielded, becoming bishop of Lindisfarne, while Eata was translated to Hexham. Cuthbert's holiness and devotion to his work made him a great power for good in the Northumbrian Church. When his end drew near, he retired again to his hermitage on Farne, where he died.[3]

11. The bitter quarrel which arose between Theodore and Wilfrid out of the subdivision of the northern dioceses, did not, happily, prevent their reconciliation before the death of Theodore. This took place September 19, 690.

[1] Bede, iv. 17. The canons of the Lateran Council of 649, which had been brought to England by John the Precentor, were adopted by the Hatfield Council. It also accepted the doctrines of the "double Procession" of the Holy Spirit. See Bright, p. 319.

[2] Bede, iv. 27, 28.

[3] March 20, 687.

Theodore was eighty-eight years of age, and had governed the Church of England for twenty-two years. By his great powers as an administrator, his strong character and determined will, his learning and high qualities, he had conferred infinite benefits on the English Church. He had organised dioceses throughout the land, had effected the commencement at least of the parochial system,[1] had restrained the violence of kings, and had strengthened in every way the influence for good. He was autocratic in his proceedings, and had no doubt angered many, but a strong ruler was greatly needed for the Church in the weak and disorganised state in which he found it, and such an one the providence of God gave to the English Church in him. He was buried at Canterbury, within the church of the monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul, the northern porch, in which his predecessors lay, being already full.

12. It is now the place to bring together the main facts in the interesting history of Wilfrid, who was contemporary with Theodore, and brought into some unpleasant relations with him. It has been already said that he took a prominent part in the conference of Whitby, and was afterwards nominated to the See of York. He thought fit to go into France for consecration, the English primate (Deusdedit) being dead, and most of the other bishops being (in Wilfrid's eyes) uncanonical through their Scotic consecration.[2] In France he obtained a magnificent consecration, but he remained so long in that country that another was put into his place at York. This, however, was remedied by Archbishop Theodore, and Wilfrid entered upon his Diocese of York (669). During the time that he had been kept out of his See, Wilfrid, whose energy was immense, had been usefully employed in Mercia, which for the moment was without a bishop. On succeeding to York, he gave himself with great vigour to his work. He found his church at York dilapidated, and repaired and beautified it; he built a grand church at Ripon, another at Hexham; he diligently laboured to improve

[1] Bright, 362.

[2] The only one whom Wilfrid would hold to be absolutely unobjectionable was Boniface, bishop of Dunwich.

the divine service, setting Eddi[1] and Œona to teach the way of responsive song, according to the custom of the primitive Church. Everywhere throughout his diocese he went teaching, confirming, and ordaining.

13. But Wilfrid's bold and energetic spirit soon embroiled him with Ecfrid, king of Northumbria. Ecfrid's queen, Etheldreda, whom he tenderly loved, was encouraged by Wilfrid to devote herself to a monastic life, and in spite of her husband's opposition received the veil from the hands of Wilfrid. The queen who succeeded her was bitterly hostile to Wilfrid. He was banished the court; and when in 678 Archbishop Theodore, at Ecfrid's invitation, visited Northumbria, he altogether sided with the king as against the bishop. Then was made that partition of Wilfrid's diocese, without any consultation with him, of which mention has been made; and Wilfrid, indignant, appealed to Rome, and determined to set off at once to prosecute his cause. On his way he was driven by stress of weather to the coast of Friesland, and landing there he zealously laboured at the conversion of the heathen inhabitants. Leaving Friesland, Wilfrid journeyed on through France, escaping by the way plots arranged against his liberty, and reached Rome about the middle of the year 679. A preliminary council was held after his arrival to consider generally the state of the English Church.[2] It was then determined that his case should be specially inquired into, and a Synod of fifty bishops was summoned to try it, in the church of the Lateran. The decision arrived at was that Wilfrid had been dealt with unfairly, that he must be replaced in his diocese, and that any division of it must be made by him with the consent of a council at York. But at the same time it was declared that Theodore's division of dioceses was right in principle; that each English kingdom was to have its bishops, and that the number for the whole country should be twelve.[3]

[1] Eddius or Eddi wrote the life of the bishop, in a strain of the highest laudation.

[2] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 131.

[3] Johnson, *English Canons*, i. 102-104; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 136; Bright, 295. Mr. Johnson holds that the decision was substantially in favour of Theodore; Professor Bright, on the contrary, that it was in favour of Wilfrid.

The Archbishop was thus encouraged to proceed in his work of increasing the episcopate, and soon after this followed the subdivision of Mercia, and the further subdivision of Lindisfarne. It does not appear that the Roman decision in favour of Wilfrid (if it is to be considered such) in any way benefited him, or changed the state of affairs. Wilfrid remained at Rome, when it would seem that he ought at once to have returned to endeavour to amend the matters in which he considered himself aggrieved. He took part in the large Synod held at Rome in 680, on the subject of the Monothelite heresy, when he should rather have been present at Hatfield; and then at length he found himself once more in Northumbria.

14. In the Witan which he attended after his return he exhibited the document obtained at Rome, which contained the favourable provisions; but it was received with contempt, and declared to have been obtained by corrupt influences. So great indeed was the anger excited in the English king and his councillors against this first appealer to Rome, that he was thrown into prison, and immersed in a dark dungeon in the midst of the rigours of winter After a nine months' imprisonment he was liberated, and he then retired into Mercia. Here, however, finding the influence of the Northumbrian king and queen, and the archbishop, too strong against him, he could not remain. He passed into Wessex, and from thence, still persecuted, he made his way into the territory of the South Saxons, the only kingdom of England which was as yet entirely heathen, with the exception of its king and queen.[1]

15. Edilwalch, the king of this country, had been baptized in Mercia; and Ebba, the queen, was a Christian princess of the Hwiccian race, so that the opportunity was very favourable for the conversion of the people. Wilfrid was eloquent and zealous; and it is said by Bede that his exhortations were greatly helped by the fact that a long

[1] For all the preceding portion of Wilfrid's history after his appeal to Rome we are dependent on Eddius. Bede merely says in one place that "he went to Rome, and returned to Britain" (iv. 13). In another, that "he was acquitted of what had been laid to his charge, and declared worthy of his bishopric" (v. 19). See Article "Eddius," *Dictionary of Christian Biography.*

drought, which had produced a terrible famine, ceased coincidently with his ministrations; and that he instructed the people in the art of fishing in the sea, they having been before contented to grope after eels in the rivers. Wilfrid established himself at Selsey, where he built a monastery (681). There he remained for five years,[1] until the death of Ecfrid enabled him to return to Northumbria. On Wilfrid's return to the north, and after the conquest of the South Saxon kingdom by Wessex, the Christians of the southern kingdom were placed under the bishop of Winchester. The conversion of the inhabitants of the Isle of Wight, which then belonged to the South Saxon kingdom, soon followed; and "thus," says Bede, "after all the provinces of the island of Britain had embraced the faith of Christ, the Isle of Wight also received the same."[2]

16. When Wilfrid returned to Northumbria (686), of which Alfrid was now king, he found the See of Hexham vacant by the recent death of Eata. To this he succeeded as administrator; but he was not inclined to be contented with anything else than his own old See of York. Bosa, the occupant of this, was by some means induced to retire, and Wilfrid was again bishop of York. But the Roman decree was not carried out. Cuthbert remained bishop of Lindisfarne, and at his death a successor was appointed to his See, and Wilfrid was content to accept the reduced See as it had been settled by Theodore.[3] It appears, however, that this contentment was not of long duration. On the proposal to erect a separate See at Ripon,[4] Wilfrid revived his claims to the whole province of Northumbria. For doing this he was banished by the king and Witan of Northumbria, and retiring into Mercia, was entrusted with the See of Leicester, then vacant by the death of Cuthwin (691).

[1] The See of Selsey, the original of Chichester, was not established till 709.

[2] Bede, iv. 13.

[3] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 171. Abercorn had been reconquered by the Picts.

[4] The monastery of Ripon had been governed by a bishop (Eathed, expelled from Lindsey, and then by Wilfrid), but it was not a See separate from York.

17. Here he remained for some time; but about the beginning of the eighth century a movement arose as to reconsidering his case. A council was held at Easterfield, a place situated somewhere in Yorkshire (702), under the presidency of Bertwald, Archbishop of Canterbury. At this Wilfrid was summoned to appear, and he came attended by many of his abbots. He was asked whether he would submit to the regulations of Theodore, *i.e.* to the subdivision of the Northumbrian diocese, against which he had appealed to Rome. He refused, and again appealed to Rome. The king and the council were much exasperated. It was decreed that Wilfrid should be deposed from the episcopal dignity. Once more he appealed to Rome, and set out in company with Acca to lay his cause before the Pope. The archbishop forwarded the charges made against him. A Synod met to consider the matter, but an obscure and temporising decision only was arrived at. It is evident that the Roman Curia feared to put itself in direct opposition to the sentence of the English Church. Wilfrid slowly returned to his country, weary and broken-spirited.

18. At another council, held somewhere on the river Nidd (706), a compromise was agreed upon. Wilfrid was to return to a Northumbrian See, but not to York. He was to have the See of Hexham and the minster of Ripon, recovering, however, his domains and monasteries. His Roman appeals had not much availed him. "In fact," says Professor Bright, "the second compromise was less favourable than the first."[1] But Wilfrid was now broken in health, and weighed down by old age, and he must needs submit.

19. After a short time spent in his northern diocese, he undertook another visit to Mercia, where he had founded many religious houses; and at length in the minster of St. Andrew, at Oundle, he died (709).[2] Thus passed away the most energetic and remarkable of the early English Churchmen—a man of wonderful activity, great resources, conspicuous talents; but a lover of pomp and show, and power and rank; a man to whom it was almost impossible to occupy a subordinate position, and for whom

[1] *Early English Church History*, p. 415. [2] Bede, v. 20.

troubles must need arise when brought into collision with the stern discipline of Archbishop Theodore, and the strong and resolute will of the Northumbrian kings. It is well remarked by Professor Bright that with the death of Wilfrid closes a "great period," and that the period which succeeded was altogether inferior, and adorned by less splendid names.

20. In order to preserve the continuity of Wilfrid's history, some matters of importance have been omitted. It is especially of interest to remark that from the death of Theodore may be noted the commencement of the parochial system. Not only did that great prelate provide a number of Sees sufficient for the government and direction of the clergy and people, but he made a strenuous commencement of the task of providing churches for the different districts, and obtaining a settled and localised clergy to officiate in them. On the first commencement of the Church in England this had been much neglected. Oratories had been erected in different places where the mission preachers had penetrated, as by Aidan, Birinus, and Cedd,[1] but no attempt had been made to provide churches everywhere. Monasteries were founded, and from these a certain amount of missionary efforts were directed to the inhabitants of the towns and villages of the country, which had as yet no settled resident clergy. But Theodore, who had above all things a talent for organising, perceived that this system would never avail to keep alive Christianity in the land; hence he encouraged the lay people to build churches for themselves, and directed that the tithes and offerings which they had before paid to the bishop should be paid to their own churches.[2] He also is said to have obtained a grant from some or all the kings of his time that those who built a church should have the right of patronage to that church; so that the parochial system distinctly took its origin from this great archbishop.[3]

[1] Bede, iii. 3, 7, 17, 22.

[2] Theodore's *Penitential* (Haddan and Stubbs), iii. 203.

[3] Thomas de Elmham says: "Excitabat fidelium devotionem et voluntatem in quarum libet provinciarum civitatibus nencon villis

21. From the period of Theodore's death, we may observe, also, more distinct relations between the State and the Church. The State undertook to protect the Church in its temporalities, and to uphold its status in the land. The first and most remarkable of these provisions was made by the laws of Ina, or Ine, a king of the West Saxons. The enactment of these laws by a Witan, or assembly of notables, was made, probably, about the year 690. They enact, under penalties, the baptism of infants within thirty days, the abstaining from work on Sunday, the observance of their rules by the monks and clergy, the due payment of church scot or dues, the right of sanctuary, the sacredness of the church building, the sacred character of the clergy.[1]

22. The same care for the interests of the Church which was displayed by King Ina in Wessex, was also shown by Wihtred, king of Kent. At a solemn assembly held at Bapchild (692), in the presence of Archbishop Bertwald, the bishop of Rochester, and many abbots and clerks, he decreed that all the churches given by his predecessors should remain in possession of the Church, that no layman should intermeddle with or seize upon the goods of the Church, and that no bishop should be appointed without the consent of the archbishop. Also, at a Witan held at Barsted, near Maidstone, in the year 696, Bertwald, the successor of Theodore, called "chief bishop of Britain," as well as the bishop of Rochester, being present, certain laws or *dooms*, partly of an ecclesiastical, partly of a secular character, were promulgated. Freedom from taxes is conceded to the Church, sanctuary recognised, rules for priests and monks prescribed, the Sunday and the fasts of the Church protected.[2]

23. A synod held in Wessex in 705 introduces us to one of the most conspicuous figures in the early Church history of England,—Aldhelm, abbot of Malmesbury,

ecclesias fabricandi, parochias distinguendi, assensus eisdum regios procurando; ut si qui sufficientes essent, et ad Dei honorem pro voto haberent super proprium fundum ecclesias construere, earundem perpetuo patronatu gauderent."—p. 285.

[1] Johnson's *English Canons*, i. 129.

[2] *Ib.*, i. 125-139.

afterwards first bishop of Sherborne.[1] The occasion of the synod was the annoyance felt by the English Church at the persistency with which the British Church adhered to their old Easter rule. It was determined to try the effect of an earnest remonstrance, and Aldhelm, famous for his learning, and his great success as a teacher, was appointed to draw up a fitting one. The letter which he wrote still remains.[2] It is a violent epistle, showing a strange ignorance of Scripture for one who enjoyed so great a reputation in his day.[3] It is addressed to Geraint, king of Cornwall, but its effect appears to have been limited to those Britons who were under West Saxon rule,[4] and who probably had other good reasons for abandoning their old traditions. The main body of the Welsh Christians did not finally adopt the Catholic Easter until after the expiration of another century.

24. About the time of the council mentioned above, Aldhelm was consecrated to the new See of Sherborne. The division of the West Saxon diocese had been determined upon long before, but had been delayed, probably, by the opposition of Bishop Heddi. This prelate died in 703,[5] and was succeeded by Daniel. A provincial council now threatened to suspend communion with Wessex if there were delay in appointing another bishop. Therefore, "in the early days of Bishop Daniel,"[6] the land was divided. Winchester retained Hampshire and Surrey, and, after a time, was able to annex to itself the Isle of Wight; Sherborne took Wiltshire, Dorsetshire, Berkshire, and great part of Somerset.[7] The administration of this large See by Aldhelm was very vigorous and successful. He retained the headship over the abbey of Malmesbury, and, by his influence with King Ina, was able to procure the foundation of the famous abbey of Abingdon, and the enrichment

[1] Bede, v. 18.

[2] See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 268.

[3] See Bright, p. 420. Aldhelm was remarkable for an extremely grandiloquent (not to say fustian) style of writing.

[4] Bede, v. 18.

[5] Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

[6] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 267. This is supposed to have been the regular annual synod provided for by the Council of Hertford.

[7] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 275.

of the ancient Glastonbury, where a church in connection with the old British structure had been raised by Anglo-Saxon devotion.

25. Daniel, bishop of Winchester, was the patron and friend of the famous Winfrid, or Boniface, who did such good work in evangelising the Germans. Wilfrid's missionary labours among the Frisians have been already mentioned. About the year 690, Willibrord, who had been educated in Wilfrid's monastery of Ripon, and afterwards studied in Ireland, went with Egbert to take up the work among the Frisians. Meeting with the support of the king of the Franks, who had subjugated part of Frisia, his labours were very successful. About the year 719 he was joined by Boniface, a young English monk from Bishop Daniel's diocese, who had, by his bishop's recommendation, first repaired to Rome to obtain the papal commission. He came to Willibrord at Utrecht, where Christianity was firmly established by their labours. Willibrord was consecrated archbishop of a See established at Utrecht, but Boniface, who aspired to more daring attacks on heathenism, would not remain here. He went into Hesse, and there, and in Thuringia, he boldly attacked the prevailing superstitions with wonderful success. Raised to the dignity of archbishop by the Pope, he continued his missionary labours in Germany for many years, until at length he reached the crown of martyrdom (755).[1]

26. The English Church at this period was indeed fertile of great men. Conspicuous among them was Benedict Biscop, who has been well described as "an ecclesiastical traveller, a founder of monasteries, and a promoter of religious art."[2] A nobly born and wealthy Northumbrian, he made no less than six visits to Rome for the purpose of acquiring manuscripts, and gaining a knowledge of Church life to be made available for the service of his countrymen. He was instrumental in introducing Archbishop Theodore to the English Church; and, having taken the tonsure, was made by him abbot of the Canterbury monastery. This he held only two years. After

[1] See Article "Bonifacius" in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.

[2] Bright, p. 189.

another visit to Rome, he was presented by the Northumbrian king with a domain on the banks of the Wear. Here he proceeded to build a monastery, obtaining skilled labour and fittings from abroad. To this house, destined to become so famous, afterwards, in connection with the name of Bede, Ceolfrid, a man in many respects like minded with its founder, was appointed abbot. On his fifth journey to Rome in company with Ceolfrid, Benedict obtained the services of John, the precentor of St. Peter's, whom he brought back with him to Northumbria to teach psalmody to his monks. Soon after this, Benedict received another grant of land from King Egfrid, on the other bank of the Tyne. Here he built the monastery of Jarrow, which was taken possession of in 681 by a detachment of the Wearmouth brethren, the two houses being intended to form one establishment.

27. The Wearmouth monks who went to the new house at Jarrow were accompanied by a little boy about eight years old, who, born on the land belonging to the Wearmouth monastery, had been "given" by his parents to Abbot Ceolfrid to be educated. This was the famous Bede, the first ecclesiastical historian of England; to whose honest and simple narrative, indeed, we owe all the knowledge we possess of the first century and a half of the Church's life in England. Born in 673, and at the age of seven dedicated to monastic life, Bede spent the whole of his time in one or other of Benedict's two monasteries, and gave his whole life to literary labours. In the little sketch of his history which he has left, he tells us that he "always took delight in learning, teaching, and writing."[1] He made it his business to compile from the Fathers interpretations of the books of Scripture, to translate histories of saints, to write lives of Cuthbert and of the founders of his monastery, and, most valuable of all, to translate into English the four Gospels,—in which sacred labour he was engaged when death came upon him. His ecclesiastical history was begun at the request of Ceolwulph, king of Northumbria, and was submitted to him for approbation. Though a recluse, mixing scarcely at all in the affairs of

[1] Bede, v. 24.

the world outside his monastery, no man has had a more important influence on the history of the English Church than the venerable monk of Jarrow.[1]

28. Before the death of Bede the monastic system, which had been very valuable in the infancy of the Church, began greatly to deteriorate, and to assume very strange and anomalous lineaments. In a letter addressed by him, very shortly before his death, to Egbert, bishop of York, the venerable monk of Jarrow strongly advocates the increase of bishops and clergy, and the taking of some of the monasteries in order to find the means of doing this. He says, there are many houses unworthy the name of monasteries, being, in fact, merely secular establishments, where all sorts of luxury and evil living are practised. It had become a rage among great people, both men and women, to get together such societies, and to preside in them. Nothing could be more unlike devotion than the way of life which they observed. Every vice was allowed and even encouraged, bringing contempt upon the name of religion. Luxury in living and in apparel, grievous unchastity, were everywhere predominant. A firm stand needed to be made against such defilements. He would that such establishments were suppressed, and a better provision made of those who might be really of use in instructing the people; and with this view he would counsel Egbert to assume the position of Metropolitan, originally destined for the See of York by Pope Gregory, and greatly to increase the number of his suffragans and clergy.[2] With this most useful counsel for the Church the life of the devout scholar and valuable historian of the Church closes, and we are left for the succeeding period to sources of information very inferior to those which he furnished.

[1] Bede died May 26, 735, aged sixty-two. He wrote, in addition to the subjects mentioned, on Astrology, Orthography, Rhetoric, Poetry, etc. See Article "Beda," *Dictionary of Christian Biography.*

[2] See Bede, *Ep. ad Egbert;* Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 314, *sq.*

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A) JOHN OF BEVERLEY.

The bishop who ordained Bede both deacon and priest was a conspicuous figure in his day, and obtained a high reputation for sanctity. He had been educated at the school of Canterbury established by Theodore. He then entered the Whitby monastery, from whence, in 687, he was consecrated bishop of Hexham. It is not, however, in connection with Hexham, but with Beverley—"the monastery called Inderwood, in the wood of the Deiri"—that Bishop John is best known. To this he retired after having been bishop, first at Hexham and afterwards at York, for thirty-three years. The fame of his sanctity grew and increased. Bede devotes several chapters to the detailed account of miracles more than usually *bizarre* and strange attributed to him, and St. John of Beverley became one of the most popular saints of the north country.

(B) TABLE OF THE DATES OF THE FOUNDATION AND NAMES OF FIRST OCCUPANTS OF THE ENGLISH SEES.

		A.D.
1.	Canterbury (Augustine)	597
2.	London (Mellitus)	604
3.	Rochester (Justus)	604
4.	York (Paulinus)	625
5.	Dunwich (Felix)	631
6.	Lindisfarne (Aidan)	635
7.	Dorchester (Birinus)	635
8.	Winchester (Wini)	662
9.	Lichfield (Diuma)	656
10.	Elmham (Badwin)	673
11.	Hereford (Putta)	676
12.	Hexham (Eata)	678
13.	Sidnacester (Eadhed	678
14.	Worcester (Bosel)	680
15.	Leicester (Cuthwin)	680
16.	Selsey (Wilfrid)	[1]681
17.	Sherborne (Aldhelm)	705

— Bright's *Early English Ch. Hist.* 448, 50.

[1] Not permanently established till 709.

CHAPTER VI.

THE PERIOD OF THE THREE METROPOLITANS.

734-803.

1. Egbert, first Archbishop of York. 2. Boniface censures the state of morals in England. 3. Exhorts Archbishop Cuthbert to hold a Council. 4. The Council of Clovesho (747). 5. Low state of morality in the country. 6. King Offa procures the erection of Lichfield into a Metropolitan See. 7. The Constitutions of Chelsea. 8. Archbishop Ethelheard. 9. Alcuin. 10. Alcuin writes against the Decrees of the second Nicene Council. 11. His Letters to Clergy in England. 12. The Council of Frankfort. 13. Ethelheard driven from Kent. 14. King Kenulf desires to restore the lost Dioceses to Canterbury. 15. Ethelheard visits Rome. 16. Pope Leo agrees to withdraw the Metropolitan power from Lichfield. 17. Council of Clovesho (803) finally decides against the Metropolitan claims of Lichfield.

1. THE counsel offered by the venerable Bede to Egbert, Bishop of York, that, with a view to the greater efficiency of discipline and the advancement of the Church, he should assume the dignity originally granted to the See of York by Gregory, and demand the pall of a Metropolitan, no doubt concurred with the wishes of that prelate on the matter. Either immediately after the letter was written —if not before it was finished[1]—Egbert became Metropolitan and Archbishop of York. Paulinus had occupied this position a century previously; but from the long interval which had intervened when York was merely an ordinary See, Egbert may be regarded as the first Archbishop of York, and first Metropolitan of the North. In the following year (735) Nothelm, a priest of London, not belonging to a

[1] See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 326. The date of his receiving the pall was probably before his consecration of Bishop Frithbert to Hexham, which took place September 8, 734. The letter was written some time in 734. See Art. "Egbert," *Dictionary of Christian Biography.*

monastic order, was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury in succession to Tatwin. Both the new Metropolitans, immediately on receiving the pall from Pope Gregory III., consecrated suffragan bishops—Egbert to the sees of Hexham and Withern; Nothelm to those of Hereford, Elmham, and Sherborne.[1] In 740, Archbishop Nothelm died, and was succeeded by Cuthbert, bishop of Hereford, sprung from a noble English family.

2. But the most influential prelate at this time in England was one who did not occupy a diocese within the limits of the island, but in a foreign country, where, as has been seen, he had gained signal success by his intrepidity and devotion. Boniface, mindful of his English origin, and of the Church of his baptism, strove earnestly to abate the scandals which were becoming painfully prevalent in England. The testimony of Bede as to the demoralisation spreading in the monasteries is unhappily confirmed by a letter which the Archbishop of Mentz and five other German bishops addressed to Ethelbald, king of Mercia. From this we learn that this king was in the habit of using the monasteries of nuns very much as royal harems, and debauching the inmates as he pleased. There were other kings also who did the same, while the nuns are freely accused of the crime of infanticide. Such a hideous state of morals drew forth the indignant and bold reproofs of this zealous Christian bishop, and induced him also to write another letter to Egbert, Archbishop of York, exhorting him to second his admonitions to King Ethelbald, and to be very diligent to repress any beginnings of these evils in his own diocese.[2]

3. But Boniface did more than this. He not only wrote hortatory letters to reprove vice, but he suggested practical means for combating it. He addressed a letter to Archbishop Cuthbert, dwelling most strongly on the great responsibilities of the pastoral office, and specially of that of chief pastors, mentioning the sad scandals prevalent in England, and exhorting him to hold a Council there, as

[1] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 335.

[2] *Ib.*, iii. 350, 358. The letters of Alcuin point also to a complete demoralisation in the monasteries.

they had lately done in Germany, in order to devise means for abating these mischiefs.[1] Incidentally Boniface mentions in this letter some special points of scandal attaching to the English. The women who went on pilgrimage to Rome, whether veiled or not, for the most part fell into vicious and licentious habits of life,[2] and he desires that such pilgrimages should be stopped. Kings and great men were in the habit of violently seizing on monasteries, expelling the abbot or abbess, and usurping all rights over the community and the property. A great luxury in clothing prevailed even in religious houses. Drunkenness was common, not only among the lay people, but among the clergy, and even bishops. Monks were violently seized and compelled to perform forced work for the king. To remedy all such scandals he would have Archbishop Cuthbert summon a Council.[3]

4. Whether in consequence of this appeal or not, a Council was held at Clovesho (747). According to William of Malmesbury, it was attended by twelve bishops, by many priests and dignitaries of the lower order, and by King Ethelbald and his nobles. Letters from Pope Zacharias, exhorting the English to amend their way of life, were read therein. Some important and interesting regulations were made by this Council. Bishops were to visit their dioceses every year; they were specially to examine and regulate abbots and abbesses; they were to go to the monasteries held by secular persons, and to insist on their providing the ministrations of a priest for the inmates. They were to ordain none without testimony of their moral life; to encourage sacred study in the monasteries, which was almost entirely neglected. It was ordered that priests should weigh well the solemn duties to which they were

[1] For the vexed question whether this letter was written before or after the Council of Clovesho, see Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 382. It seems to me impossible, from the contents of the letter, to put it after the English Council.

[2] He even says, "Perpaucæ sunt civitates in Longobardiâ vel in Franciâ aut Galliâ in quâ non sit adultera vel meretrix gentis Anglorum."

[3] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 376.

called; that they should preach and baptize diligently. That they should learn the exact meaning in their native tongue of the Latin words of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the order of Mass and Baptism; that they should use one uniform method of performing their office, and be careful to see that all baptized persons were acquainted with the Creed; that they should not declaim in a theatrical style the words of their offices, but use a simple melody, or else read them just as they speak, and not presume to use the parts assigned specially to bishops; that the great festivals and the festivals of the martyrs should be always celebrated on the same days on which the Roman Church celebrates them, and with the same hymns and psalms that the Roman Church uses; that the Lord's day should be strictly observed by the cessation from all worldly employments, and by using it in religious services and hearing the word of God; that the seven canonical hours should be observed with such psalms and prayers as the Roman Church uses; that solemn litanies should be said by clergy and people on April 23 and the three days before Ascension day, with fasting and the celebration of mass at the ninth hour to implore pardon for the sins of the people; that the natal day of St. Gregory and the day of the burial of St. Augustine should be observed as holy days; that the Ember fasts of the fourth, seventh, and tenth months should be strictly observed;[1] that monks and nuns should live regular lives, and not wear showy dress; that bishops should see that the monasteries do not become the receptacles of poets, musicians, and buffoons, and that the lay people have not free access to them, which was the cause of grievous scandals, and that the nuns do not spend their time in luxury or in working vain embroidery, but in reading and singing psalms; that those belonging to monasteries and all ecclesiastics should avoid the sin of drunkenness, and not drink early in the day; that the religious and clerks who abstain from Holy Communion on account of their evil lives, and do not confess and amend, be severely reproved; that lay persons, both young and

[1] The first of the Ember fasts is not mentioned here, apparently as being included in the season of Lent.—Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 376.

old, be encouraged to frequent communion; that none be admitted to the tonsure without strict examination of their previous lives; that the bishops take care that the decrees of the Synod be made known in their dioceses; that almsgiving be practised after a religious manner, and not with the view of gaining license thereby to evil living, nor of excusing oneself from fasting and works of penance; that psalmody also be used with understanding, and that none think that this will obtain for them license to abstain from other good works, or that their sins can be put away by the religious services and fasting of others; that no ruler of a monastery take more into his society than he can feed and clothe, and that those who have professed religion do not return to the luxurious garments of the lay people; that professed religious do not dwell among the lay people; that in order to prevent ill-feeling from the laity towards ecclesiastics, prayers be offered at the canonical hours for kings and those in authority, and for the safety of all Christian people.[1]

5. The canons thus enacted form a picture of the Church of that day, and it must be confessed not a flattering one. The severe charges brought against the monasteries by Boniface are fully confirmed by the regulations now sanctioned. The monasteries appear to have been often the private property of the abbot,[2] and no rule either of dress or living seems to have obtained in them save at his will. The Penitential of Archbishop Egbert, by the variety of foul crimes which it specifies, the small penances it prescribes for many of them, and the saving clause it often introduces, "si in consuetudine erit," implying that a single lapse need not be animadverted on, also indicates a low state of morality.

6. The over-lordship of the country was at this period wielded by a king of great power, vigour, and talent—Offa, king of Mercia. He was on friendly terms with his great contemporary Charlemagne, who treated him as the Emperor of the West, as he himself claimed to be the

[1] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 362-376; Johnson's *English Canons*, i. 240-263.

[2] *Dialogus Egberti.* Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 408.

Emperor of Eastern Europe.[1] He was triumphant not only over his neighbour kings, but over the British also in Wales, who became his vassals. In the fulness of his power Offa determined that his own proper kingdom of Mercia should not ecclesiastically be in an inferior position to that kingdom of Kent which he had subdued, or the kingdom beyond the Humber which he far surpassed in power. He determined that the See of Lichfield should be raised into the dignity of an archbishopric and a metropolitan See. Pope Adrian, who had learned to respect and perhaps to fear[2] the powerful king of England, despatched Legates into England "to renew the faith and the peace which St. Gregory had sent by Augustine the bishop,"[3] and with these Legates Offa held a council at Chelsea in the year 787, when Jaenbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, "gave up some portion of his bishopric;" and Higbert, Bishop of Lichfield, was constituted archbishop, with the four other bishops of the Mercian kingdom and the two East Anglian as his suffragans.[4] The new Metropolitan, under the powerful patronage of his king, even takes precedence of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Offa obtained from Rome the pall for Archbishop Higbert, and also the grant of special privileges for the great monastery which he was about to found at St. Albans.

7. In this same Council of Chelsea, when the dignity of Canterbury was thus grievously intruded on, a body of constitutions or canons, brought by the Legates George and Theophylact from Rome, was proposed to and accepted by the English Synod. The Legates had previously visited the northern province and obtained the assent of the Metropolitan of York and his suffragans to these constitu-

[1] Palgrave, *Hist. of England*, i. 88.

[2] See his letter to Charlemagne as to the rumour that Offa intended to dethrone him.—Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 440.

[3] Anglo-Saxon Chron., *s.a.* 785.

[4] A.-S. Chron.; Wilhelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pontif.*, p. 16 (ed. Hamilton); Johnson's *English Canons*, i. 264 *sq.*; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 446. There were only four bishops left to the Province of Canterbury, viz. London, Winchester, Rochester, and Selsey. See Thomas de Elmham (ed. Hardwick), p. 334.

tions,[1] which form the most direct interference of the Church of Rome in the affairs of the English Church that had yet been attempted. The substance of the constitutions was as follows:—(1.) The Nicene faith and that of the six General Councils was to be firmly held. (2.) Baptism was to be used at the canonical times, and only those were to be baptized who knew the Creed and the Lord's Prayer. Sponsors were to undertake for infants that they should be instructed in these. (3.) Two Councils to be held every year; bishops to be diligent in visiting their dioceses. (4.) Bishops, canons,[2] monks, and nuns to use proper apparel as the Easterns (*i.e.* those of France and Italy). (5.) On the death of an abbot or abbess, a successor to be chosen by the community and approved by the bishop. (6). Bishops to be careful as to the ordination of fit persons to the priesthood. (7.) All churches to have service at the canonical hours. (8.) The privileges conferred by the Roman See on certain churches to be observed. (9.) Fasts to be properly observed. (10). Priests to wear drawers in consecrating; proper bread to be offered at the Eucharist. The chalice not to be made of horn; bishops not to judge secular matters. (11.) Kings to show due deference to bishops and priests. (12.) Kings to be duly reverenced by all. (13.) Justice to be strictly administered. (14.) Concord and unanimity to be observed. (15.) Incestuous marriages forbidden, specially with the virgins dedicated to God. (16.) Illegitimate offspring not to succeed to an inheritance. (17.) Tithes to be strictly paid. (18.) Vows to be rigidly performed. (19.) All heathen rites to be avoided. (20.) All to be exhorted to timely confession and repentance. This document was accepted and signed by the bishops and abbots, the kings and nobles, of the northern and southern Councils.[3]

[1] At the Synod of Pincahala (perhaps Finchale, near Durham).—See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 444, 445.

[2] This is the first use of this word for canons living in community. The rule of Chrodegand for secular canons was published about fifty years before.—Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 461.

[3] In the north six bishops, in the south twelve, sign. The signature of Higbert is as Bishop, not Archbishop, of Lichfield, probably

8. In 791 died Jaenbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, who had been constrained to surrender so large a portion of his province to the Archbishop of Lichfield, and two years afterwards was consecrated to the primacy Ethelheard, supposed to have been by birth a Mercian, and to have been consecrated to the archbishopric by the Archbishop of Lichfield.[1] If this were the case, it would account for so long an interval as two years having elapsed between his election and consecration. The Kentish clergy would naturally be indignant at the diminution of the authority of the Metropolitan See, and would not desire in any way to recognise the new archbishop, or to accept his assistance.

9. In the time of Ethelheard a great figure emerges into prominence in the English Church, and a worthy successor of the Venerable Bede is found not only instructing and enlightening his own countrymen, but acting as the principal teacher and educational guide of the whole of Western Europe. Alcuin was born at York before the middle of the eighth century.[2] He came of a noble family, and was quickly distinguished by his talents and industry in the school of Egbert, Archbishop of York. On Egbert's death in 766 he became master of the York School, and soon brought pupils by the fame of his teaching from Gaul and Germany. Archbishop Ethelbert ordained him deacon, and treated him with much consideration; and the succeeding Archbishop Eanbald, who had been Alcuin's pupil, sent him to Rome to obtain the pall for him. In Italy he met with Charlemagne, who was already acquainted with his merits, and remained with him as his instructor till 790, when he returned to England and obtained the consent of his king and archbishop to take up his abode permanently with Charlemagne as the director of his vast educational schemes.[3]

10. It was now the time when the Church was being

because he had not yet received the pall.—See Johnson, *English Canons*, i. 264-285; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 447-462.

[1] But Thomas de Elmham calls him "Bishop of Winchester" (p. 335).

[2] Probably 735.

[3] See Art. "Alcuin" in *Biog. Brit. Lit.*—A.-S. Period.

convulsed and distracted by the question of image-worship. In 787 met the second Council of Nicæa, sometimes called the Seventh Œcumenical, which decided that a lower sort of worship (προσκυνησις) was due to images, on the ground of the worship paid to them being, in fact, paid to the originals of the image. The decrees of this Council were sent for acceptance to Charlemagne, the powerful Emperor of the West, but he was by no means inclined to concur with them. Instructed as he had been by Alcuin, and brought into contact with the heathen idolatry of the Saxons, with whom he had carried on war, he saw the false principles and palpable danger of the Nicene decrees, and prepared vigorously to oppose them. Knowing well the mind of Alcuin in the matter, he sent to him in England the synodal letter received from Constantinople, desiring him to ascertain the opinions of the English Church thereupon. This Alcuin readily performed, and despatched, in reply to the emperor, "a letter admirably confirmed by the authority of the Divine Scriptures," refuting the statements of the Eastern Council. This letter was despatched, not in his own name alone, but in that of the bishops and princes of England as well, whom he had consulted in the matter.[1]

11. The letter to Charlemagne may have been carried by Alcuin himself, or, at any rate, he soon followed it to the court of that monarch. Here, though busied in forwarding the various schemes of the emperor, he was yet not unmindful of the wants of the Church of his native land, and addressed letters of exhortation and guidance to his friends in England. A letter of his, written in 793 to the monks of St. Peter at Wearmouth, praises them generally for their observance of their rule, but specially

[1] Simeon Dunelm., *s. a.* 792. Mr. Haddan says, "Simeon was, no doubt, drawing from the ancient annals of the Northumbrian kings, which this portion of the work represents, and which gave it its extreme value as representing a contemporaneous record of the eighth century."—Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 469. The question as to how far Alcuin was the author of the *Libri Carolini*, the treatise which Charlemagne published against Image-worship, is a difficult one. He was probably, in great part, the author of them.

warns them against pomp and pride in clothing, and luxury in food.[1] Shortly after this, Alcuin addressed a letter to the bishop and clergy of Lindisfarne of a sadder nature. The savage irruptions of the Danes had now begun to harass and vex England. The special fury of these pagan rovers was directed against churches and monasteries, and the monastery of Lindisfarne, exposed as it was to the sea, was naturally an early victim to their attacks. Alcuin condoles with deep sorrow with the persecuted monks. "What church," he says, "in Britain can hope to escape, if St. Cuthbert and so many saints could not defend them? But perhaps this is a judgment for the sins of the brethren. Avoid, then, luxury in dress; avoid drunkenness, lustfulness, covetousness. God often chastens, and then restores more than has been lost. Do thou, O holy father (Bishop Higbald), be strenuous in preaching and working for Christ."[2] Another letter, written in the same year (793) was addressed to Ethelheard, Archbishop of Canterbury, being the year of his consecration. It bids him think of "the great and illustrious doctors, the lights of the whole of Britain," who have preceded him in his office. While he offers his devotions in the midst of the relics of their most holy bodies, he will certainly be aided by their prayers if, unmoved by blandishments and unappalled by threatenings, he strives to follow in their footsteps.[3]

12. In the year after these letters were written was held the great Council at Frankfort (794), in which the Adoptivist heresy, which had sprung up in Spain, and the decrees in favour of image-worship, which had been accepted at Constantinople, were both condemned. At this Council all the authorities agree that English bishops were present.[4] The records of the Council of Frankfort are extremely interesting, as it was, in fact, the first movement of the Western Church to assert its independence of the East. The vast power of Charlemagne, the control which he exercised over the Pope, the earnestness with which he had adopted the views advocated by Alcuin, availed to make nearly three hundred prelates, including deputies from Rome,

[1] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 470.
[2] *Ib.*, iii. 472.
[3] *Ib.*, iii. 474.
[4] *Ib.*, iii. 481.

set themselves in complete opposition to the arrangement lately sanctioned both by Constantinople and by Rome as to image-worship. By the action of this Council, which the Pope afterwards sanctioned, the Roman See was withdrawn from the danger of falling into a position subordinate to that of Constantinople. The Church of the West was, as it were, founded. The Roman Bishop, whose power was growing less and less, received a sudden and enormous accession of influence, though at the cost of his own consistency, as he now repudiated that which, a little before, he had accepted. When it is considered how important a part Alcuin bore in forming the mind of the emperor, and determining the policy which brought about the Council of Frankfort, and thus gave strength and vigour to the Western Church, it must be admitted that the English Church has had no small share in colouring the religious history of Christendom.

13. The acquiescence of Ethelheard in the diminution of the authority of the See of Canterbury made him a very unpopular archbishop in Kent. About the year 796, an attempt was made by Eadbert Prœn[1] and the Kentish nobles to shake off the yoke of Mercia; and the archbishop, a Mercian, and a partisan of Offa's rule, was made the subject of attacks, so that he fled away from his See, and sought a refuge with the Mercian king.[2] The powerful Offa died about the time that these troubles began, but his successor, Kenulf, was after a time able to reduce Kent to obedience, and to restore Ethelheard to his See.[3] For his desertion of his post, Ethelheard is somewhat severely taken to task in a letter addressed to him by Alcuin, where he is recommended to do penance for this lapse. At the same time, Alcuin speaks of it as most desirable that the dignity of the See of Canterbury should be restored, and the schism healed, not taking from Arch-

[1] He was an apostate priest. He held the chief power for about three years.

[2] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 495, 510.

[3] Egfrid, who had been made king in his father's lifetime, but died before him, was desirous to do this had not death prevented him.—Thomas de Elmham, p. 336.

bishop Higbert his position of Metropolitan so long as he lived, but preparing that at his death things should return to their old arrangement.[1]

14. Of the same mind in this matter was Kenulf, the new king of Mercia. He saw that the opposition developed against Ethelheard in Kent was a difficulty in the way of upholding his authority, and that he obtained no substantial benefit from the metropolitan position of Lichfield. He therefore wrote to Pope Leo, magnifying the dignity of the See of Canterbury, and adding, "The honour of this dignity, King Offa, on account of the ill-will which he entertained towards Jaenbert, the archbishop, and the Kentish people, first strove to impair by dividing Canterbury into two provinces, a proceeding which your predecessor, Adrian, confirmed, honouring the bishop of the Mercians with a pall. We would desire your Holiness to consider whether this be not a rending of the coat of Christ, and whether it would not be well to restore the former unity."[2] The Pope answers that "the establishment of the position of Lichfield had been done at the desire of King Offa, and of all his nobles, on account of the large size of his dominions, and for many other good causes."[3] He does not say anything definite as to restoring the jurisdiction to Canterbury, but he reminds Kenulf, significantly, that Offa had promised very large gifts to the See of St. Peter.

15. As matters did not progress very rapidly, Archbishop Ethelheard determined on a visit to Rome. He had first held a conference with Eanbald, Archbishop of York, and had ascertained, probably, that no opposition would be offered by him to the return to the old state of things. There is a letter from Alcuin to Ethelheard touching this journey, in which, as in all his letters, he speaks severely of the ostentation and luxury of the English clergy, and trusts that they will not exhibit these in foreign lands to the scandal of the Church. He also promises Ethelheard his horse with a saddle suitable to an

[1] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 518.

[2] Willelm. Malmesb., *De. Gest. Reg.*—Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 522.

[3] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 524.

ecclesiastical rider. Alcuin also wrote to the Emperor Charles to recommend the archbishop to his protection.[1]

16. The journey of Ethelheard appears to have been efficacious, as in the year following that in which it was undertaken, the Pope addresses to him a letter giving to him and his successors the authority "over all the churches of the English, as it had been in old times,"[2] and threatening with deposition any who refused to concede this authority to him. By another letter to King Kenulf, the Pope informs him of what he has done, and declares that he has fully restored to him the jurisdiction which had been taken from his See.[2]

17. Leo had thus undone that which his predecessor Adrian had done by granting the pall to Bishop Higbert. But there remained the fact that the erection of Lichfield into a Metropolitan See was not the act of the Pope, but of the English Council of Chelsea. If, therefore, the arrangement was to be undone, it must be undone also by an English Council. Accordingly, in the year 803, in the "celebrated place" called Clovesho, where so many councils had been held, was assembled a meeting of Archbishop Ethelheard, eleven bishops of the southern province, divers abbots and presbyters, as well as King Kenulf and some of his great men; and the metropolitan dignity was solemnly taken from Lichfield and restored to Canterbury. The act of the Council recites what had been procured by King Offa to the great detriment and injury of the See of of St. Augustine, and declares that with the co-operation of Pope Leo, Ethelheard, and all his fellow-bishops, and all the dignitaries there assembled, had determined that an Archiepiscopal See should never be allowed any more in Lichfield, nor in any other place save Canterbury, and that the pall granted by Pope Adrian to Lichfield availed

[1] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 532, 533.

[2] *Ib.*, iii. 537. No mention is made of York, but it cannot have been intended to change the relations then existing between Canterbury and York.

[3] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Reg.*—Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 539. See Thomas de Elmham (p. 336), who gives all the credit to Ethelheard.

nothing, inasmuch as it had been obtained by surreptitious means and false representations.[1] Thus did this dispute at length terminate, and Lichfield subsided into its former place of one of the suffragans of the See of Canterbury.[2]

[1] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 542.

[2] Archbishop Higbert appears to have resigned. He signs one of the Acts of the Council as Higbert-*Abbas*.

CHAPTER VII.

THE PERIOD OF THE DANISH TROUBLES.

803-925.

1. Supremacy of Wessex. 2. Orders for Reformation of Monasteries. 3. Remonstrance of English Bishops against the Primate being obliged to go to Rome for the Pall. 4. Quarrel between King Kenulf and Archbishop Wulfred. 5. Council of Chelsea, 816. 6. Stoppage of Church progress through Danish invasions. 7. The Dotations of Ethelwulf. 8. Destruction of Monasteries and Churches by Danes. 9. Martyrdom of King Edmund. 10. Ceolnoth introduces Secular Clerks at Canterbury. 11. Settlement of the Danes, and Baptism of their Chief. 12. The Ecclesiastical Laws of King Alfred. 13. The Laws agreed upon between him and Guthrun. 14. Alfred's account of the English Church in the Preface to Gregory's Pastorale. 15. Other books translated by King Alfred. 16. The learned men patronised by Alfred. 17. The new Bishops—Pope Formosus and Archbishop Plegmund. 18. The Church under Edward the Elder. 19. The Laws of King Athelstan.

1. DURING the earlier part of the ninth century the supremacy which had been long enjoyed by Mercia is transferred to Wessex, and Egbert, by a series of brilliant victories over the other English kings, as also over the Britons of Cornwall and Wales, becomes fully established in the state and honour of the eighth Bretwalda, or supreme governor of the island of Britain.

2. The history of the Church during this period is somewhat obscure. No doubt, in the councils which were so constantly held, remedial measures for the evils and scandals of the time were devised, though often, probably, but imperfectly carried out. In that same Council of Clovesho, which had terminated the metropolitan state of Lichfield, a remedy was sought to be applied to the crying abuses which, by the acknowledgment of all, prevailed in the monasteries. Secular persons were no longer to be allowed to preside as

abbots, and the monasteries were all to observe a *rule*, not, as it appears, a uniform one, but as it is expressed, "such an one as is contained in the privileges granted by the Apostolic See, or was delivered by apostolical men in the beginning of the infant Church in sacred canons, or even such as was appointed by the special possessors of the monasteries." This constitution is signed by 12 bishops, 25 abbots, 41 presbyters, 1 archdeacon, and 4 deacons; so that from it we may gain a pretty clear idea of the composition of the ecclesiastical council of the time.[1]

3. In the year 805 died Ethelheard, Archbishop of Canterbury, and was succeeded by Wulfred, who had been his archdeacon. After his election and consecration, the clergy in synod assembled addressed a letter of remonstrance to Pope Leo on the custom which had been growing up of the English Metropolitans being obliged to go to Rome to solicit the pall from the Pope. They point out to him that Augustine, though only a priest when sent to England, was not required to go to Rome for consecration, but to the French bishop of Arles, and that the pall was afterwards sent to him. In like manner, by the directions of St. Gregory, when a Metropolitan died, the other who survived was to consecrate a successor, and Gregory promised that palls should be duly sent, as they had been to Paulinus, consecrated by Justus, and Honorius, consecrated by Paulinus, as also to the three bishops consecrated by Augustine, who in turn occupied the Metropolitan See of Canterbury, viz. Laurentius, Mellitus, and Justus. They desire that the ancient custom should be preserved, and the English Metropolitans freed from the burden which had been imposed upon them.[2] In consequence of this remonstrance the pall was sent to Wulfred in the following year.

4. By a letter addressed to the Emperor Charles by Pope Leo, in the year 808, we find that the Metropolitans both of Canterbury and York[3] were on bad terms with their respective kings. The Pope solicits the help of the

[1] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546-7. There are numerous indications that the Benedictine rule was not observed in the English monasteries before the Conquest.

[2] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 559. [3] *Ib.*, iii. 562.

Emperor to heal the quarrel; but, in the case at least of the southern Metropolitan, it was not healed, but went on increasing, until at length it culminated in one of the strangest and most obscure episodes in our early Church history, viz. the infliction of a six years' interdict on the southern province. The learned editors of the *Councils of Great Britain* think that the origin of the quarrel may be traced "to a similar series of circumstances to that which caused the establishment of the archbishopric of Lichfield —the jealousy felt by the Mercian king towards the Kentish Primate, which arose after the deaths of Ethelheard and Cuthred, and was probably intensified by the dislike of the friendship of the archbishop with the emperor."[1] King Kenulf seized upon the Kentish monasteries of South Minster and Reculver, which properly belonged to the archbishop, and by representations made at Rome, having gained the Pope to his side, was able to cause the suspension of the archiepiscopal authority, and, it would seem, of all ministerial functions through the land for six years. "The whole nation was deprived of the benefits of primordial authority, and of the ministry of holy baptism, for six years."[2] About midway in this period there was held a council in London, when King Kenulf met the archbishop and offered to be reconciled to him, to set him right with the Pope, and, it would seem, to restore the monasteries which he had seized, if he would give to him a town of his (called Leogenerhamme) and the sum of 120 pounds of denarii. Should the king fail in his conditions, the money to be restored. On the other hand, if the archbishop did not consent, he was threatened with perpetual exile, and the loss of all his goods. Wulfred was very unwilling to

[1] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 587. Yet it is remarkable that Kenulf was the person who moved in the matter of *doing away* the archbishopric of Lichfield.

[2] *Canterbury Cartulary;* Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 602. "It is difficult," say the editors of the *Councils*, "to believe that so strange and unprecedented an event as a virtual interdict should have taken place unmentioned by any of our annalists; but the evidence for it depends on an original contemporary Act and ancient version of the same recorded in the Cartularies of Canterbury and Worcester."—H. and S., iii. 587.

come to terms, distrusting the king utterly; but he was over-persuaded by the chief persons of the land, who earnestly desired the reconciliation. He yielded, therefore; but as he had expected, King Kenulf held fast to his monasteries, did not take any steps to remove the interdict, and altogether falsified his promises. The dispute was only terminated by the death of Kenulf in 822, and even then his daughter Cwendritha, an abbess, continued to hold the archiepiscopal estates until she was finally obliged to give them up by the Council of Clovesho in 825.[1] Thus ended this singular quarrel. As to the interdict, it does not seem clear whether it was inflicted by the Pope at the request of Kenulf, or by Kenulf himself with the consent, or at least connivance, of the Pope. The latter, however, appears best to accord with the expressions used in relation to it.

5. Before the quarrel between the king and the archbishop had become strongly developed, a council was held at Chelsea, in which the Mercian king, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the southern prelates, were present (816). The canons enacted at this council contain some points worth noting. Canon 2 ordains that all churches, when built, should be consecrated by the bishop with the sprinkling of holy water, and all other ceremonies prescribed in the Book of Ministrations;[2] that the Eucharist, with the relics, should be enclosed in a case and preserved in the church, and that there should be a representation (depictum), either on the walls or on the altar, of the saints to whom the church was dedicated. Canon 5 ordains that the *Scoti* (Scotch or Irish priests) should not be allowed to minister, as their orders were uncertain. Canon 10 enacts that on the death of a bishop the tenth part of his goods should be given in alms to the poor; also, that every Englishman who has been adjudged to slavery to the bishop should be liberated; that in each church in the diocese 30 psalms should be sung for the soul of the deceased; that each abbot and head of a religious society should cause 600 psalters[3] and 120 masses

[1] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 603.

[2] This is a reference to the service for dedication contained in Egbert's *Pontifical* (ed. for Surtees Society).

[3] *Psalterios*—Mr. Johnson translates *Psalms*. It is singular to ob-

to be said for his soul, should liberate three men, giving each three shillings; that all religious persons should fast for a day, and for thirty days at the seventh canonical hour sing a paternoster for him, and on the thirtieth day of his obit feast in the refectory.[1]

6. Beornwulf, who had succeeded Kenulf in the kingdom of Mercia, was more disposed to respect the Church and its officers than his predecessor had been. Not only did he at once on his accession bring about the termination of the dispute which had caused so much trouble in the Church, but he also made liberal grants of land to the archbishop, moved "by the love of God and the venerable rank of the prelate, and by the grace of consecration which he had received from him."[2] But Beornwulf was but a sub-regulus or tributary king. The real power was in the hands of Egbert, king of the West Saxons. There is but little on record of church matters during his rule, though some grants of lands made by him to churches are preserved. He was engaged in incessant war. During the last years of his reign the attacks of the Danes were continual, and they were ever gaining in strength. They were sometimes joined by the Welsh, who still nourished an undying hatred to the Anglo-Saxon invader. Under Egbert's son Ethelwulf, the country suffered still more. London was stormed and pillaged. Rochester and Canterbury shared the same fate. Ethelwulf fought vigorously against the heathen invaders, and in the year 851 gained such important successes over them, that there seemed a hope of a period of tranquillity.

7. It was a few years after this, viz. in 855, that King Ethelwulf made that grant or arrangement which is frequently said by historians to be the origin of tithes and glebe—in fact, to be the formal endowment by the State

serve that the singing of psalms is put upon just the same footing as the saying of masses.

[1] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 579. The curious word *beltidum* is used here. It denotes the *bell-time*, or the time of ringing the bell for the prayers of the canonical hours, and not a "*belt* of paternosters," as it is somewhat absurdly translated by Johnson, *Eng. Canons*, i. 307.

[2] Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 590.

of the Church of England. All the Chroniclers say that he gave "the tenth of the whole kingdom, or the tenth of all his possessions," to God and the Church for ever, free from all exactions and impost.[1] The fact of the gift of Ethelwulf is undoubted, but what did he give? He could not make a *new dotation* of the tenth of lands and goods, inasmuch as this has been given long before, was probably introduced by Augustine, was certainly regulated by Theodore, was accepted as part of the law of the Church by the Council of Chelsea (787), and had been given by King Offa. But what Ethelwulf seems to have done, was to enact by a formal State ordinance that which was previously the accepted custom and law of the Church, and at the same time give the tenth of his own lands and possessions. Before this probably the Church had but little power of enforcing that which was hers by law and custom. Ethelwulf supplied this power, and made tithes, which had always been the law of the Church, become now also the law of the State as well.[2] It is said that the king himself was an ordained priest,[3] so that this care for the interests of the clergy would be all the more natural in him. Soon after making this grant, Ethelwulf went to Rome. His absence gave occasion to an unnatural conspiracy of his son Ethelbald against him, in which Alstan, bishop of Sherborne, took part. The forgiving king resigned part of his dominions to his son. His Christian charity was further manifested by an ordinance, that on every tenth hide on his estates a poor man should be clothed and kept.[4] He is also said to have built a

[1] Decimam totius regni sui partem—decumavit de omni possessione suâ—decimavit totum regni sui imperium—regni totam terram decumavit—decimam omnium hydarum concessit—decimam regni sui contulit.

[2] See the discussion of this point in Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 636, and the quotations from Kemble. I have not exactly followed his conclusions. Dr. Hook says:—"He devoted to religious and charitable uses a tenth part of his private estates, and released from all payments due to him as king, a tenth part of the folklands or lands unfranchised."—*Lives of the Archbishops*, i. 287.

[3] Collier, i. 363. [4] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gestis Reg.*, ii. 113.

monastery at Rome "to the glory of God and the honour of St. Mary, His holy mother, and there to have placed an English school, which ever by night and by day should serve God for our people."[1] But the most important matter which Ethelwulf did at Rome was the causing his youngest son Alfred, who had been previously despatched to the holy city for instruction and information, to be crowned by the Pope as king,[2] thus marking him out as the successor whom he desired, and leading his mind to the contemplation of the high destiny which was before him.

8. Before, however, Alfred reached the throne, the Church and people of England were to suffer direful calamities. One after another all the great monasteries which had risen up in the central and northern parts of England were destroyed by the fury of the Danish invaders, the monks slain, and the churches burnt. Thus Bardney, Croyland, Peterborough, Ely, and Ramsey perished, and in the north the famous monastery of Lindisfarne and all the religious houses of Northumbria were destroyed. Winchester was burnt, as London, Canterbury, and Rochester had previously been. York was captured, and in the words of the old chronicle, "there were strife and sorrow over England."[3] The fury of the Danes was specially directed against everything connected with the Christian religion, while the English Christians gave many examples of heroical fortitude and constancy in the profession of their faith, in spite of the heathen fury of their assailants.

9. Of these, none was more remarkable than that shown by Edmund, king of the East Angles, who, being captured by the Danes, was treated with every possible cruelty, in order to make him deny his faith. But he steadfastly refused to yield, and gloried in declaring himself a Christian. He was then tied to a tree and made a mark for the arrows of the Danish soldiers; but nothing could shake his constancy, until at length the Danish chief-

[1] Charter printed in Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 647. Said by Kemble to be spurious.

[2] A.-S. Chronicle.

[3] *Ib.* p. 61.

tain, wearied out, ordered him to be beheaded (870). A later king of Danish race, who had embraced the religion which his progenitors so much hated, reared in honour of the royal martyr a splendid monastery at the place which still bears his name.[1]

10. During the ravages of the Danes in which Kent especially suffered, as the invaders had established a regular camp on the Isle of Sheppey, Archbishop Ceolnoth appears to have escaped to Rome, as the chronicle reports that he died there in 870.[2] It is recorded of this archbishop that he introduced secular clerks into the monastic establishment of Christ Church, Canterbury, the monks having dwindled down to the number of five, and the first care of his successor Ethered, who had himself been a monk in that monastery,[3] was to drive out these intruders.

11. At length a deliverer was raised up for the persecuted English. Alfred, who succeeded to the throne of Wessex in 871, after several years of struggles with the invaders, in which he sometimes was reduced to the utmost straits, at length in 878 defeated them in a great battle at Ethandune. The immediate results of this victory were such as to cause a complete revolution in the state of England. Large portions of territory were now conceded to the Danes as settlers, and their principal men adopted Christianity. The territory which they occupied was called Danelagh, and appears to have gradually extended to the whole district north and east of the Watling Street. Guthrun, their chief, had at his baptism Alfred as his godfather, and assumed the name of Athelstan. Thus somewhat of quiet was given to the land, though the incursions of the foreign and heathen Danes did not cease.

12. It was about the period of the settling of the Danes as dwellers in the land, that King Alfred published his ecclesiastical laws. They form a very remarkable document. The code is prefaced by the Ten Command-

[1] Palgrave, *Hist. of England*, i. 117. [2] A.-S. Chronicle, *s. a.*

[3] Not of St. Augustine's, as Dr. Hook states, *Archbishops*, i. 298.

ments and a number of the judicial laws of Moses from the Book of Exodus. "It is not easy," says Mr. Johnson, "to say with what view King Alfred put this scriptural preface to his laws, if it were not to show his great esteem for God's Word. There is no hint given that he expected his people should make the judicial precepts of Moses the rule of their actions."[1] The purpose, indeed, is evidently not to set them forth as laws, for the king adds immediately that Christ came not to break or repeal these Commandments, but to enlarge them with everything that is good, and He taught mercifulness and humility. Then follows a short account of the Council of Jerusalem, and the directions given to the Gentiles as to the ceremonial law. Then it is said that since that time Christian men have held many synods, and appointed mulcts or punishment for various crimes; of these Alfred the king had made a collection, selecting those which he thought right, and making divers alterations, and these, with the consent and approval of his counsellors, he now set forth for men to observe. (1.) The first law is that every one be compelled to observe strictly his oath and covenant. (2.) The second establishes sanctuary in a monastery for three nights. (3.) The third appoints fines for breach of suretyship—five pounds with the king, three with the archbishop. (4.) The fourth allows sanctuary in a church for seven nights, but no food is to be given to the fugitive; and it enacts that "if any man betake himself to a church for any crimes whatever, that were before unknown, and there confess them in God's name, half the mulct shall be forgiven him." (5.) The fifth enacts that if any man steal anything in the church, he not only forfeits the mulct, but the hand with which he stole; if he will ransom his hand, he must pay his weregild. Double fines for thefts on Sunday, Christmas, Easter, Holy Thursday, the Lent fast, and the Perambulation days. (6.) For stealing a nun from a monastery 120 shillings were to be paid, half to the king, half to the bishop and the lord of the monastery whose property the nun was; neither she nor her child could inherit property. (7.) For adultery, 120 shillings, but if the woman be of low degree, less.

[1] *English Canons*, i. 113.

(8, 10, 13.) Unchaste actions towards a woman of low degree to be punished by small fine, a woman of higher rank more,[1] a nun double. (9.) To fight or draw a weapon in presence of an archbishop incurs a fine of 130 shillings,[2] in presence of a bishop or alderman, 120. (12.) If a priest slay another man, all his property to be forfeited, and he to be degraded, then to be expelled his monastery unless his lord will compound. (14.) "If any man implead another of a breach of promise to God, and will accuse him for that he has not performed somewhat that he had plighted, let him first give his oath on it in four churches, and the other, if he will justify himself, let him do the same in twelve." (17.) Burglary in the king's borough to be fined 120 shillings; in the archbishop's, 90; in the bishop's or aldermen's, 60. In Lent the mulct to be doubled. For tearing down the holy veil in Lent,[3] 120 shillings. (20.) Holidays to be given to free servants, "but not to slaves and drudges"—twelve days at Christmas; first day of Lent (or first Sunday in Lent); St. Gregory's mind-day (March 12); seven days before Easter, seven after; one day at St. Peter and St. Paul's tide (June 29); a week before St. Mary's mass in harvest (August 15); one day at All-Saints; and to slaves are given the four Wednesdays in Ember weeks for their own use.[4]

13. Besides these laws which King Alfred published for the general direction of his people in matters connected with religion, there was a certain special agreement made between him and Guthrun, the newly converted Dane, as to the religious government of these neophytes in the faith. These laws are curious as indicating the first restraints put upon a violent and fierce people, nurtured in heathenism.[5]

[1] This distinction appears in all the laws, and seems entirely opposed to all notions of even-handed justice.

[2] That is, a greater fine than for the ravishing a nun, or committing adultery.

[3] This appears to have been a custom lately introduced, of putting up a veil between the church and the altar in Lent, so that the people could not see the mass. It was much resented.—Johnson, i. 326.

[4] Johnson's *English Canons*, i. 310-330.

[5] They were republished in 907 as the Laws of Edward and Guthrun.

The first assures peace within the walls of the church. The second orders a fine for apostasy from the faith. The third appoints fines to priests, for crimes or for failure in their duties, but if a priest commits murder he is to be reserved to the bishop's doom. The fourth appoints fines for incest. The fifth declares that a man condemned to death should not be denied shrift. The sixth authorises ecclesiastical dues, and prescribes the punishment for murder. The seventh, eighth, and ninth forbid, under penalties, the sale of goods or work on Sundays or fast-days, and also the use, on that day, of purgation by oaths or ordeal, and executions. By the tenth a condemned malefactor, if he have lost a limb and survived the third night, may be spared. By the eleventh witches and open whores are to be driven away. By the twelfth a man in orders or a stranger committing a capital crime may be allowed to make satisfaction.[1]

14. But the laws which King Alfred promulgated for guidance in ecclesiastical matters do not represent the whole, or indeed the chief benefits which he conferred upon the Church. A far greater boon were the schools which he established, and the books which with his own pen he rendered into the English tongue. From the Preface to one of these, the Pastoral of St. Gregory, may be seen, as depicted by the king, the extreme need which existed of some educational help. After speaking of the enlightenment which existed in the English Church in former days, the king goes on, "So clean was it ruined amongst the English people, that there were very few on this side the Humber who could understand their service in English; and I think there were not many beyond Humber. So few such there were that I cannot think of a single one to the south of the Thames when I began to reign. . . We have loved only the name of being Christians, and very few the duties. When I thought of all this, then I thought also how I saw it before it was all spoiled and burnt, how the churches throughout all the English nation were filled with treasures and books, and also with a great multitude of God's servants; and yet they knew very little of the fruit of the

Some conjecture that there was a second Guthrun, but there seems no ground for this.

[1] Johnson, *English Canons*, i. 332.

books, because they could understand nothing of them, because they were not written in their own language. . . . Therefore it appears to me better that we translate some books which seem most needful for all men to understand into that language we can all understand, and cause all the youth that is now in the English nation of free men, such as have wealth to maintain themselves, may be put to learning till they can read well English writing; afterwards let people teach further in the Latin tongue those whom they will teach further and ordain to higher degree. When I thought how the learning of the Latin language before this was decayed through the English people, though many could read English writing, then I began, among other divers and manifold affairs of this kingdom, to translate into English the book which is named in Latin *Pastorale*, sometimes word for word, sometimes meaning for meaning, as I learned it of Plegmund my archbishop, and of Asser my bishop, and of Grimbald my presbyter, and of John my presbyter. After I had then learnt it so that I understood it as well as my understanding could allow me, I translated it into English; and I will send one copy to each bishop's See in my kingdom, and on each one there is a stile of the value of fifty mancuses; and I bid in God's name that no one take the handle from these books, nor the books from the minster, unknown, so long as there are any learned bishops, as (thanks to God) there are now everywhere. Therefore I would that they remain always in their places, unless the bishop will have them with him, or it be lent somewhere until somebody write another copy." [1]

15. Besides the Pastoral of St. Gregory, the other books translated by King Alfred were (1) the Chronicle of Orosius, containing a history of the world to the fifth century, and incorporating the accounts of two northern voyagers, Andher and Wulfstan, which had been given to the king personally; (2) Bede's History of the English Church; (3) The Soliloquies of St. Augustine; (4) Boethius de Consolatione Philosophiæ; (5) The Psalms which were left

[1] King Alfred's Preface to *Gregorii Pastorale*, Wright's Trans.—*Biog. Lit.*, p. 397.

unfinished, and (probably) some other parts of the Scripture. He also composed a Manual, containing prayers and psalms, historical anecdotes and observations. A Book of Proverbs, attributed to him, and a version of Æsop's Fables, are probably neither of them genuine.[1] So large an amount of literary work, done under such great difficulties, and in the midst of so many military and civil labours, is indeed astonishing.

16. But not alone did King Alfred furnish the instruments for the education of his subjects, he was also careful to provide the machinery by which such instruments might be applied and made effectual, by the schools which he founded, and the learned men whom he brought from various quarters to work in them. Among these latter may be noted Grimwald, who was made abbot of the newly restored monastery of Winchester, and a learned priest of the nation of the Old-Saxons, named John, to whom Alfred is also said to have given an abbey.[2] Plegmund, who had been leading a hermit's life in the neighbourhood of Chester, he called forth from his solitude, to take upon himself the metropolitan dignity of Canterbury (890). Other learned men were called to his court, and promoted by him, as—Bishop Werfrith, the Abbot St. Neot, and the priests Ethelstan and Werwulf. Especially is to be noted one, whose name is intimately connected with that of Alfred, as having had attributed to him the life of the famous king, namely, Asser, abbot of St. David's,[3] who was promoted to the bishopric of Sherborne. A man more famous than any of these, Joannes Scotus, surnamed Erigena, cannot be shown to have been one of Alfred's body of

[1] *Biog. Lit.*, p. 395.

[2] *Biog. Lit.*, p. 392. Grimwald was a monk of St. Bertin, in France. The See of Canterbury, when vacated by the death of Ethered, was offered to him by Alfred. He declined it.—Hook's *Archbishops*, i. 322.

[3] There is great doubt as to whether Asser, the bishop, was in reality the author of the Life of Alfred which bears his name (see Mr. Wright in *Biog. Lit.*, *s. v.*) The Welsh Church was now completely in communion with the Church of England, as is shown by the application of Cameliac, Bishop of Llandaff, to Archbishop Ethered for consecration.—Hook, i. 310.

learned men. His name has been confounded with that of the other John mentioned above; but as he was by birth an Irishman, and by adoption a Frenchman, the English Church can scarcely take credit for his great reputation.[1] The staff of learned teachers which Alfred had thus collected he used for instructing the young nobles in a school which he established, in which instruction was given both in Latin and English. But there is no sufficient authority for asserting that Alfred established this school at Oxford.

17. Under the fostering care of Alfred the Church of England advanced greatly in learning and vigour. But some evil consequences resulted from the higher standard required by the king in those who were to govern the Church. From the lack of suitable persons to fill them, a large number of Sees were left vacant. This drew forth a letter from Pope Formosus, who declared that he had formed the intention of putting the nation under an interdict, but on the representations of Archbishop Plegmund had changed his intention. He desired that they would speedily proceed to carry out the needful reforms. It was not, however, till some years after this letter had been sent, and after the death of Alfred, probably in the year 905, that Archbishop Plegmund consecrated seven new bishops; so that the statement made by William of Malmesbury, and repeated by numerous writers, that the Pope constrained the king and bishops of England to act by placing the land under an interdict, is unfounded. Pope Formosus died in 896, and it was certainly not till ten years after this date that the new bishops were consecrated.[2] The names of the prelates consecrated were Fridstan, for Winchester; Werestan, for Sherborne; Kenulph, for Dorchester; Beornock, for Selsey; Athelm, for

[1] For an account of Joannes Scotus, see Notes and Illustrations to this Chapter.

[2] See Johnson's *English Canons*, i. 336, and Mr. Baron's notes *ad loc.* It is a very obscure passage of history. Brompton says that the seven bishops were all for West-Saxony, and were consecrated in the twenty-second year of King Alfred (ed. Twysden, p. 812); Gervase of Canterbury, that they were for all England, and were consecrated under King Edward (ed. Twysden, p. 1644).

Wells; Eadulph, for Crediton; and Athelstan, for Ramsbury, in Wiltshire.[1] But it must remain at least doubtful whether all these prelates were consecrated at the same time.

18. The erection of the new sees of Wells, Crediton, and Ramsbury, by Edward, the son and successor of Alfred, indicates that he, like his father, was zealous for the well-being of the Church. He is also recorded to have confirmed the ecclesiastical laws of King Alfred. But during the constant wars in which he and his successor, Athelstan, were engaged with the Danes, the progress which King Alfred so eagerly desired was much impeded. The tenth century is, nevertheless, remarkable for great developments both in Church and State. It is the "age of the chroniclers, and abounds in legal and disciplinary enactments in the native tongue."[2]

19. In the year 925, Athelstan, the son of Edward the Elder, succeeded to the throne; and in that year (or soon after) certain ecclesiastical laws were set forth by him, "with the advice of Wulfelm, his archbishop, and other his bishops." (1.) The first of these enacts that all the king's reeves and aldermen shall pay tithes of all the royal possessions, and that nothing shall be exempted. Also that from every two of his farms one poor man shall have food and clothing given to him, and one man be set at liberty. (2.) The second, that those who break into churches shall make satisfaction "as the doom books direct." (3.) The third decrees punishment for witchcraft and magical arts. (4.) The fourth regulates the coining places which were allowed to the bishops.[3] (5.) The fifth prescribes the

[1] See Mr. Griffiths' Notes to Inett, chap. xviii., who shows that William of Malmesbury substituted the word *Cornubiensem* for *Corvinensem*, which is the word in the MS. from which he copied, and means Ramsbury. Mr. Griffiths is of opinion that there is no sufficient evidence for the consecration of these seven bishops at one time by Plegmund.—Inett, *Ch. Hist.*, i. 376, note 1.

[2] Stubbs's *Const. Hist.*, i. 240.

[3] "At Canterbury let there be seven coiners, four of the king's, two of the bishop's, one of the abbot's. At Rochester three, two of the king's, one of the bishop's."—Johnson's *Eng. Canons*, i. 343. Coins of the archbishop's of a much earlier date than this are known.

religious ceremonies to be used by the man who goes to ordeal before his trial. (6.) The sixth forbids marketing on Sundays. (7.) The seventh ordains that a perjured person shall not be admitted afterwards to take an oath, nor be buried in consecrated ground.[1] The above laws were enacted at a council held at a place called Gretanleu, supposed to be Grantley, near Andover. Other ecclesiastical laws were afterwards set forth by this king in councils which he held at Exeter, Feversham, Thunderfield, and London. Some of these are rather of the character of general exhortations to good living than laws, as for instance—"It concerns priests in their diocese diligently to help every one as to what is right, and not to suffer, if they can help it, one Christian to hurt another; and that every master be compassionate and condescending to his servants in the most indulgent manner that is possible. The slave and the freeman are equally dear to the Lord God who bought them, and bought them all with the same price; and we are all of necessity servants to God, and He will judge us in the same manner that we on the earth judged them over whom we had a judicial power."[2] Others prescribe that in every cathedral fifty psalms should be sung for the king every Friday. Others prescribe the *weregild* or life-value of the different personages of the realm. An archbishop was valued as an earl, a bishop as an ealdorman.[3]

From the meagre notices of Church affairs to be gathered during the troublous period of the Danish wars, we pass to a period more full of interest, and in which Churchmen of greater importance and power perform their parts.

[1] Johnson's *Eng. Canons*, i. 337-345.
[2] Johnson, i. 350. [3] *Ib.*, i. 352.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

JOANNES SCOTUS, NAMED ERIGENA.

JOANNES SCOTUS, surnamed Erigena to mark from what part of the Scotic race he sprang, is one of the grandest figures in the early literary history of Europe. We know nothing of his antecedents; he appears first in history at the court of Charles the Bald about the middle of the ninth century. He was the tutor, friend, and literary director of the emperor. Possessing an accurate knowledge of Greek, he translated into Latin the writings of Dionysius the Areopagite, and adopted much of the fanciful mysticism of the "celestial hierarchy." His speculations in philosophy led him to adopt opinions very similar to those which are now described as pantheistical; but he did not consciously or intentionally reject the doctrines of Christianity. On the contrary, he defended many of them with great skill and power, as, for instance, the doctrine of free will against the fatalism of Gotteschalcus, and that of the spiritual or transcendental character of the presence in the Eucharist against the materialist theory of Paschasius Radbert. Berengar of Tours, in his treatise on the Eucharist, constantly appeals to this work of Erigena as expressing his views. He tell us that it was written at the request of Charles the Bald. The book was condemned to be burned, together with Berengar's writings, by the Council of Vercellæ, and is generally supposed to be lost; but there is good reason for believing that it is the identical treatise which now passes under the name of Ratramn or Bertram (see Labbe and Cossart, *Concil.*) Erigena's great work is called the *Division of Nature*, an abstruse and difficult treatise, which, like some of the works of the schoolmen, affects to treat the whole extent of knowable matter. In this there are many dangerous speculalations, as for instance, that as all being is centred in God, sin and rebellion have no proper being, and cannot be rightly spoken of as existing—they are mere negations. This might easily be used as a prop for Antinomianism. The character and writings of Erigena have been investigated with much care by Mr. Maurice in his *History of Philosophy.*

CHAPTER VIII.

THE CONTEST BETWEEN THE SECULARS AND REGULARS.

942-988.

1. Overthrow of the Monastic System. 2. Archbishop Odo. 3. Odo's Canons. 4. His zeal for high ecclesiastical views. 5. Triumph of the extreme Churchmen. 6. Dunstan succeeds to the Primacy. 7. Bishop Ethelwold at Winchester. 8. Bishop Oswald at Worcester. 9. Establishment of the Benedictine rule. 10. Practice of clerical matrimony. 11. Gradual displacement of married clergy. 12. Ascendency of the monks during the reign of Edgar. 13. Contest revived on death of Edgar. 14. The Council of Calne. 15. The latter days of Dunstan. 16. Canons of the reign of Edgar. 17. Penitential Canons.

1. ONE effect of the prolonged troubles inflicted upon England by the Danish wars had been to raise the authority and influence of the secular clergy as compared with the monastic. In its first beginnings the English Church had been eminently monastic. Clergy unconnected with monasteries scarcely figure at all in its annals.[1] But the cœnobitic life had developed into grievous corruptions and abuses, such as are found recorded in the pages of Bede and Alcuin. There was no uniform restraining authority to check the tendency towards license within the religious house, no sufficient protection for it from influences from without. The strict rule of Benedict had been introduced into but few, perhaps none, of the English houses. The rules varied infinitely, and sometimes seem to have been merely the capricious will of the proprietor of the house. Upon the societies thus enfeebled by luxury and careless living had come the great storm of the Danish invasions. Monasteries being the most prominent bulwarks of the Church which these heathen despised and hated, and being for the most part rich, were especially the object of their

[1] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 226.

attacks. Thus, in the Northumbrian houses in the north; in the great Mercian houses of Bardney, Croyland, and Peterborough; in East Anglia and in the south, the murder of the monks, the spoiling and burning of the houses and churches, had been perpetrated. As the Danes receded, or subsided into Christianity, there were but few religious houses left to take a position of influence, while the secular clergy being more easily replaced, and having been probably more fortunate in evading the attacks of the invaders, stepped into the places of the regulars, whether monks or canons regular, and occupied the houses and lands which had been vacated by them, but without adopting their rule. Thus we find an archbishop of Canterbury placing secular clerks in Christ Church monastery, because there were "but few monks remaining to do God service,"[1] and at Winchester, Worcester, and throughout the north, secular canons had stepped into the place of regulars. The bishops, the representatives of the secular clergy, had become more powerful in the land by performing secular offices both civil and military. The clergy were generally married, and abundance of charters providing for the transmission of ecclesiastical estates to the direct heirs of the body[2] prove that this was a recognised and legal state of things. From this condition of things the tenth century witnessed a great recoil in the Church of England. This was brought about mainly by the energy and power of one man—the abbot, statesman, and archbishop Dunstan,[3]—but inaugurated, and in its commencement vigorously pushed forward, by the resolute and unscrupulous action of Archbishop Odo.

2. Odo was born of Danish parents, and disinherited and driven from his home because he manifested a disposition to listen to Christian teachers. He was protected and educated by one of King Alfred's nobles, and is said to have learned with remarkable facility both Greek and Latin.[4] He was baptized and ordained subdeacon, and after a decent interval, deacon and priest. He then accom-

[1] A.-S. Chron. *s. a.* 870. [2] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 224.

[3] For Dunstan's early life, see Notes and Illustrations to this Chapter.

[4] Osbern, *Vita Odonis*, printed in *Anglia Sacra*, vol. ii. p. 79.

panied his patron to Rome, where his devotion to the clerical life was confirmed.[1] He became well known to King Edward and afterwards to King Athelstan, and was by the latter appointed to the bishopric of Ramsbury, which had been cut out of the See of Sherborne. He was with King Athelstan in the battle of Brunanburgh, and rendered him remarkable assistance.[2] Two years after his accession (942) King Edmund appointed Bishop Odo to the See of Canterbury, vacant by the death of Wulfhelm. Odo's first step was in strong contrast to the character which had previously distinguished the bishop. "Forsaking the party of the secular clergy, to which he had hitherto belonged, he declared that no one was fit to be an archbishop of Canterbury unless he had first become a monk." No monastery professing the true rule of St. Benedict then existed in England. Odo repaired therefore to Fleury in France, where a monastery had been established on the model of the famous convent of Monte Cassino. He returned a monk duly professed, and was enthroned at Canterbury in the year 942.[3]

3. Odo's first care was to restore and renovate the cathedral of Canterbury, which had suffered great dilapidations during the Danish troubles; his next, to publish a body of canons or constitutions to regulate various parts of ecclesiastical discipline. (1.) The first of these declares Church property free from secular burdens, and demands restitution of any property that had been taken from the Church. (2.) The second claims obedience from kings, and all that are in authority, to the archbishops and bishops. (3.) The third charges bishops to exercise an active supervision of their dioceses, and to preach constantly. (4.) The fourth admonishes priests to live so as to gain respect for

[1] He is said by William of Malmesbury to have served as a soldier before he took clerical orders.—*De Gest. Pontif.*, Saville Script., p. 114.

[2] The author of his Life says that when the king's sword was broken, and he stood helpless before his enemies, Odo provided him with another by a miracle.—Osbern, *Ang. Sac.*, ii. 81.

[3] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pontif.*, Saville, p. 114. The writer of Odo's life, Osbern, says that an abbot of Fleury came to England to initiate him in the rules of the order.—*Ang. Sac.*, ii. 82.

their habit, and to instruct the people both by doctrine and example. (5.) The fifth bids them observe the ancient canons of the Church. (6.) The sixth enjoins monks to abide in their monasteries, and live according to their rules. (7.) The seventh forbids marriage with near kindred or nuns. (8.) The eighth enjoins concord and unity. (9.) The ninth orders the careful observance of the fast days and of the Lord's day. (10.) The tenth enjoins the payment of tithes.[1]

4. Odo also addressed a synodical epistle to the bishops of his province, exhorting them to devotion to their office and the zealous performance of their duties. Of the zeal of the archbishop there could indeed be no question, but that he was lacking in gentleness and Christian charity is equally apparent. He threw himself with impetuous earnestness into the support of the policy advocated by Dunstan, and sanctioned by the kings Edmund and Edred. "The palace assumed the severe air of a monastery;"[2] everywhere the monasteries were encouraged to adopt the Benedictine rule, and the married clergy were discountenanced. So long as the secular power was completely in accord with the ecclesiastical, this revival of a stricter rule for the clergy went on without check; but on the accession of the young Edwy, in 955, a change took place. Without adopting the hard things said by the chroniclers against this young prince, it is easy to understand that the strict and sombre regimen of the archbishop and Dunstan was distasteful to him. He showed himself little inclined to advance their authority, perhaps even espoused the cause of the secular and married clergy. Then, as the biographer of Odo puts it, "the bishop became his enemy."[3]

5. Nothing could more strikingly illustrate the vast ascendency which, in the powerful hands of Dunstan and Odo, the Church had now obtained, than the events which followed. The tragical story of Edwy and Elfgiva is well known. But Dunstan would not have dared to force the young king from his wife's embraces that he might take his place at the banqueting hall, nor would Odo have ven-

[1] Johnson's *English Canons*, i. 358-63. [2] *Hist. Lit.*, 430.
[3] Osbern, *Vita Odonis*, *Ang. Sac.*, ii. 83, 84.

tured first to cause the branding of the face of the beautiful Elfgiva, and to send her to Ireland as a slave, and then, on her return, to cause her to be put to death in a most merciless fashion,[1] had not all the powerful nobles of the land supported him in his cruel proceedings. It is true that the rage of Edwy compelled Dunstan to fly, but this seems to be due to a demand for the return of a treasure which had been deposited with him at Glastonbury, and which he could not readily account for.[2] Edwy could really make no head against the powerful ecclesiastics. When the quarrel was declared between him and Odo, the archbishop was able, by his influence, to deprive him of the larger portion of his kingdom, all England north of the Thames being given to his brother Edgar; and the despairing death of Edwy, and the return of Dunstan, marked the complete triumph of the extreme Churchmen.

6. Around the name of Dunstan controversy still continues to rage. On one side he is designated as the very ideal of unscrupulous ecclesiasticism, on the other, as a patriot statesman, who was scarcely at all concerned in the ecclesiastical changes then proceeding.[3] But whatever ecclesiastical measures were taken by the government of Edgar, for these Dunstan is surely responsible; and as his apologists fairly claim for him to be judged by the laws of Edgar as to the legislation of which he approved, so the policy prevailing under Edgar must have been the policy of Dunstan, who was throughout the trusted right hand and *alter ego* of the king. On the death of Odo, probably in 958,[4] Elfsy, bishop of Winchester, was ap-

[1] These acts are distinctly attributed to Odo, and credit duly taken for them by his biographer Osbern.—*Ang. Sac.*, ii. 84.

[2] Lappenberg, ii. 133.

[3] On the one side we have Mr. Hallam and Dean Milman, on the other Mr. Robertson and Mr. Stubbs. Mr. Stubbs has printed, with a somewhat laudatory preface, five monkish lives of St. Dunstan (Rolls Series). All the writers appear to marshal their facts according to their views of what the *fitness* of such a narrative requires. They frequently contradict each other. Mr. Stubbs in his latest work says: "The memory of Dunstan has suffered rather than gained by the praises of his monastic admirers."—*Const. Hist.*, i. 241.

[4] For the chronology of these events, see Mr. Stubbs's Introduction to the *Memorials of Dunstan*, p. xcii. *sq.*

pointed to succeed him. He is represented by the chroniclers as entirely opposed to the policy of Odo, and as having insulted his tomb,[1] but he perished by cold in his journey across the Alps to obtain the pall at Rome. Byrthelm, bishop of Sherborne, was then nominated to the primacy, but before he could take possession of it, Edwy died, and the nomination was retracted in favour of Dunstan.[2] Having thus (959) reached the highest place in the Church, Dunstan proceeded, with the concurrence of the king, to fill the chief Sees with Churchmen ready to carry out the Benedictine revival, and to promote the ascendency of the regular over the secular clergy. In 961 he consecrated Efstan and Oswald his successors in the Sees of London and Worcester, while Ethelwold, his "old fellow-pupil or disciple," was made bishop of Winchester. From this point commences the great struggle between the monks and clerks, the regulars and seculars, which is the chief feature of the Church history of this period.

7. The dioceses of Winchester and Worcester were the chief scenes of this struggle. The bishop appointed to the first of these was the abbot of Abingdon, who had already introduced the Benedictine rule into that monastery, as Dunstan had done at Glastonbury. Eadmer, the Monk of Canterbury, has given a graphic account of the proceedings of Bishop Ethelwold at St. Swithun's. The canons who had usurped the place of the original monks are represented as men of dissolute and licentious lives, and had been frequently admonished by their bishop to abandon their irregularities, and to accept the regular discipline. They often promised to do this, but always neglected to perform their promises. At length the bishop appeared in the choir of the church where they were collected for service, with a number of monkish dresses, and bade them assume these at once, together

[1] Osbern, *Vita Odonis, Ang. Sac.*, ii. 85.

[2] Dunstan was already a bishop, having been consecrated probably in 957 as an "unattached" bishop, and subsequently receiving the Sees of Worcester and London.—Stubbs's Introduction to *Memorials of Dunstan*, p. xci.

with the obligations which they entailed, or quit the church. In vain the canons protested. The bishop, backed by all the power of the Church and the State,[1] was too strong for them. Some of them accepted the monkish profession; others left the church, and their places were filled by monks brought from Abingdon. The dispossessed canons carried their grievances to the king, and a council was held at Winchester to investigate the matter. In this the historian represents the party of Ethelwold as near being vanquished, when a voice was heard to issue from the crucifix which commended his policy. Whatever was the cause, it appears that the bishop's vigorous proceedings remained for the present undisturbed.[2]

8. The same writer, in his Life of Oswald, describes the proceedings at Worcester. The canons of the cathedral were, it appears, too strong to be disturbed by violence, so the bishop had recourse to artifice. He built a new church to the honour of the Virgin, and entrusted it to Benedictine monks. Their services became so popular, that the cathedral was deserted. The dean was thus induced to take the habit of a monk, and many of the canons followed his example. Gradually the control and service of the mother church of the diocese passed into the hands of the Benedictines. Many of the other churches in the diocese of Oswald were in like manner transferred from the secular to the regular clergy.[3] But when in 971 Oswald for his zeal was translated to York, his energy appears to have suddenly ceased. "During twenty years we do not read that he introduced a single colony of monks, or changed the constitution of a single clerical establishment."[4] Possibly Oswald's reasons for thus relaxing his strictness at York may have been the same which induced Dunstan not to attempt a change at Canterbury. It is certain that secular canons continued

[1] He is said to have been accompanied by a State officer.

[2] Eadmer, *Vita Dunstani, Memorials of Dunstan*, p. 211, *sq.* The account is given with some variations by other chroniclers. Some appear to put the story of the Crucifix to a subsequent Council.

[3] Eadmer, *Vita Oswaldi, Ang. Sac.*

[4] Lingard, *Ang. Sac. Church*, ii. 290.

under his rule to occupy Christ Church, though in after times they were displaced.

9. Meantime Ethelwold at Winchester proceeded vigorously in the monastic revolution. He founded two new abbeys at Winchester, one for monks, another for nuns. From Chertsey and Milton he removed the clerks to make way for monks with the regular discipline, and he restored and enriched with the aid of the king, the ruined abbeys of Ely, Thorney, and Peterborough.[1] Altogether, under the reign of Edgar, no less than forty monasteries practising the Benedictine rule were established. The revolution thus effected at the chief centres of ecclesiastical power did not extend universally to the country clergy, and there were many cathedrals also, which still retained their prebendaries, though these were now compelled to live according to a rule.[2]

10. The general enforcement of clerical celibacy was a matter still harder to compass than the substitution of regular monks for irregular canons. That this was attempted by Dunstan and his party there can be no question, but with what success is doubtful. In the laws of the Northumbrian clergy (A.D. 950), clerical matrimony appears as a legalised practice, inasmuch as regulations are made for priests' wives without any condemnation of their marriage.[3] "It is plain," says Dr. Lingard, "that the bishops confined themselves to entreaties and expostulations, to general censures, and the denunciation of punishment in the world to come. They deemed it imprudent, in the existing circumstances, to proceed to particular instances of severity, and to provoke a still greater evil by depriving the offenders of the power of exercising their ministry in the rural churches."[4] It is evident, indeed, that the practice of matrimony amongst the clergy was so general, and had so much of legal prescription to support it, that those even who were most opposed to it did not venture to attempt any distinct legal prohibition of it. Among the canons

[1] A.-S. Chron., *s. a.* 963.
[2] Lingard, ii. 297, note.
[3] See Canon 35, Johnson's *Eng. Canons*, i. 377.
[4] Lingard, *Anglo-Saxon Church*, ii. 253.

enacted in the reign of Edgar, there is only one which touches this matter. "If a mass-priest, or a monk, or a deacon, had a lawful wife before he was ordained, and dismisses her and takes orders, and then receives her again by lying with her, let each of them fast as for murder, and vehemently lament it." [1]

11. But what could not be done by legal enactment was attempted by censure and influence; and gradually, by the exercise of royal and episcopal power, a large number of the married clergy were put out of their benefices.

12. It is not to be supposed that the expulsion of the secular canons from the cathedrals, and of the married clergy from many of the chief benefices, could have been accepted by the persons aggrieved without opposition. They were a powerful body, backed by powerful support in the country, and Dunstan could not but perceive that when a less vigorous hand than his own should be at the helm of affairs, they might probably succeed in regaining what they had lost. He endeavoured, therefore, to fortify his position, by procuring, at a Council held at Winchester, an enactment that the monks should be the electors to a vacant See, and that the bishop should be of the regular order. This, of course, could only apply to those cathedrals where monks were in possession, but it served to prop up and establish the newly revived monastic influence.[2] During the reign of Edgar, the party of the secular clergy could make no head against their opponents. The king was altogether under the control of Dunstan. "He believed in his counsel as in his own life, and received all that was said by him as though

[1] Johnson's *Eng. Canons*, i. 437. "This canon, on which apparently depends the charge of persecuting the married clergy, made so commonly against Dunstan, is an extract from Penitentials of a much earlier date, and cannot with any certainty be assigned to him as its re-enacter."—Stubbs's Introduction to *Memorials of Dunstan*, p. cvii. The Council and speech of Edgar, as given by Ethelred, abbot of Rievaux, quoted doubtfully by Dr. Lingard, but adopted by Mr. Martineau (p. 190), seem to be a pure myth.

[2] Lingard, *Anglo-Saxon Church*, ii. 298.

it were spoken by the very mouth of God; and thus he ordained what was to be ordained, and condemned what was to be condemned." [1]

13. But when Edgar died (975), and his young son Edward succeeded, affairs assumed a different aspect. The succession to the crown was disputed. Edward's step-mother desired to substitute for the son of Edgar's choice her own son, and a powerful noble, Alfere, ealdorman of Mercia, upheld her side. The whole of the influence of the secular clergy was naturally given to this faction. The ealdorman of Mercia expelled the monks from his territory, and replaced the married clergy with their wives.[2] In fact, the contest that arose, threatening civil war in the land, was not so much a contest between the rival princes as between the seculars and regulars.[3] Help came to the former from the north. Many of the expelled clergy had fled to Scotland, and they now returned from thence, bringing with them as an ally a bishop named Beornhelm, "a man almost insuperable both for talent and eloquence," [4] with whose aid they were able to make a stand against the party of the regulars, although by Dunstan's influence the young Edward had now been crowned king.[5]

14. The parties were so equally balanced, that both sides agreed to meet at a Council at Calne (978), when the rival claims of the two clerical factions should be argued, and it should be decided whether the seculars were to remain ejected from their benefices, or be reinstated in them. At this Witan all the chief persons of the land were assembled. Bishop Beornhelm argued eloquently for the married clergy. Dunstan, either from inability to meet

[1] Osbern, *Vita Dunstani, Mem. of Dunstan*, p. 110.

[2] Simeon Dunelm., p. 160, ed. Twysden.

[3] Lappenberg, ii. 146.

[4] Osbern.

[5] Some writers—*e.g.* Dr. Lingard and Dr. Hook—assert that another Council was now held at Winchester, in which the regular party got the better. I do not find sufficient authority in the Chronicles for this, though it is mentioned by William of Malmesbury. Dr. Lappenberg does not adopt it. There is, however, great obscurity about these Winchester meetings, and at which of them the miracle of the speaking crucifix is alleged to have happened.

his arguments, or from policy, said little in reply. "The matter," he declared, "had long ago been settled by the divine declaration. He should not open it again. He was aged, and he desired to pass the rest of his days in peace. He committed his cause to the Lord." As the archbishop said these words, the floor of the room in which the large assembly was gathered gave way, and all were precipitated among the ruins except the archbishop and his supporters.[1] This was held to be a practical decision of the matter by an interposition of Divine Providence, and the cause of the secular and married clergy was lost. Everywhere zeal was displayed in favour of the Benedictines. Monasteries sprang up, in which their rule was strictly practised, and the policy of the Archbishop and of Bishops Ethelwold and Oswald was triumphant.[2]

15. The tragical death of Edward by the plot of his stepmother, the weak boyhood of Ethelred, which left the country completely in the hands of Dunstan, confirmed the triumph of the regular discipline. But as Ethelred's reign advanced, and the king displayed his dislike to the great Churchman, Dunstan gradually withdrew from political affairs, and devoted himself to the religious life at Canterbury. The picture of his later life is thus drawn by a friendly hand:—"His chief employment was in the divine service, prayer and psalmody, and holy vigils; now and

[1] This occurrence has given rise to all sorts of comments. The age esteemed it a miracle. Later writers have in many cases thought it a plot contrived by Dunstan. Dr. Hook appears to lean to this latter opinion. But the supposition appears to be too monstrous to be entertained except on the clearest evidence, and there is no evidence whatever. On the other hand, Dr. Lingard, who, with great scorn expressed for the unfairness of Protestant writers, is himself by no means always a fair writer, relates the occurrence as though Dunstan *only*, by "fortunately clinging to a beam," escaped. He has indeed the short notice in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle to quote, but he certainly should have mentioned the fact that both Osbern and Eadmer say that not alone Dunstan, but his friends also, escaped (*Mem. Dunstan*, 114, 213). Dr. Lingard is equally unfair in giving the account of Edgar's rape of the young woman at Wilton. He omits to mention that Osbern distinctly calls her a nun (p. 109).

[2] Eadmer, *Vita Dunstani*, *Mem. Dunstan*, p. 213.

then he resumed the employments of his youth, exercising his old skill in handicraft in the making of musical instruments like the organs which were kept at Malmesbury, or the bells that were known at Canterbury as his own work; the early hours of the day he gave to the very needful task of correcting the faulty manuscripts of the library. Even after he had retired from political life, leaving Ethelred to mismanage his kingdom as he chose, the great domains of his church afforded him abundance of public work; it was his delight to make peace between man and man, to receive and assist the widows and the fatherless, pilgrims and strangers of all sorts. As an ecclesiastical judge he never stayed his hand against unlawful marriages, or in the maintenance of ecclesiastical order. He was an admirable steward of the Church's wealth, a founder and endower of new churches, and indefatigable in the work of instruction, gathering young and old, men and women, clerk, monk, and lay, to listen to his teaching. . . . There is nothing grotesque about the man as he appears in the pages of the eyewitness; nothing of the tyrannical ascetic. It is the crowning of a laborious life, of a man who has had great power and has used it for his country, and who now, that other rulers have arisen who do not know or love him, falls back on the studies of his youth, and spends his last years in the promotion of pious and learned works."[1] The death of Dunstan took place in 988, but before that period the reappearance of plundering bands of Danes and Norsemen threatened a renewal of those troubles from which the country under Dunstan's administration had been exempt.

16. Among the canons passed in King Edgar's reign, but the exact date of which is uncertain, there are some that deserve special notice. Several of them recognise the institution of a yearly Synod, which had been preserved as

[1] Stubbs, Introduction to *Memorials of Dunstan*, p. ciii. Dr. Hook takes also, upon the whole, a favourable view of Dunstan (*Lives of Archbishops*, vol. i.), but he enumerates among his other merits "his merits as a literary man." Mr. Stubbs, however, ruthlessly overthrows this when he says that "not a single literary monument of Dunstan survives, not a single letter that can by any possibility be attributed to him" (p. cix.) But see Wright, *Biog. Lit.*, p. 459.

a regulation of the Church, though doubtless with many interruptions, from the time of the Council of Hatfield. To this the clergy are to bring their books and their vestments for divine ministration, and ink and parchment for writing down instructions. They are to be accompanied by their servants, and to make presentments of their grievances and of any criminous persons who refuse to submit to penance. By another canon the clergy are bid to be diligent in teaching the manual arts. Another, speaking of the time at which baptism is to be administered, orders that every child shall be baptized within thirty-seven nights, and that no one shall remain too long unbishoped. Priests are to be careful to discourage sorcery and heathen worship, as of fountains, trees, and stones. All Christian children are to be taught *Paternoster* and *Credo*. Sunday is to be observed as a day of rest from business. Churches are to be kept for divine ministrations, and no idle and profane words, nor any indecent drinking, are to be permitted within them. None are to be buried in churches but those of holy lives. Mass is only to be celebrated in a church, except in cases of extreme sickness. For mass there must be always a hallowed altar,[1] and the priest must never celebrate without book. He must always have a corporas or napkin, and wear all the fitting mass vestments.[2] He must never celebrate alone without some one to make the responses for him. The housel must be taken fasting. No priest must celebrate more than *thrice* in one day. The housel must be kept with reverence always ready, and if it become corrupted must be burnt. The priest must be careful to have pure bread, pure wine and water. He must always eat the housel himself when celebrating, and never twice hallow it. The chalice must always be of metal, not of wood; a light must always be burning in the church when mass is sung. There must be holy water, salt, frankincense, bread. No woman to be

[1] This requirement probably gave rise to the custom of having *super-altars*—small pieces of stone or metal, which had been duly blessed, and which were inserted into the wooden table.

[2] The word *subumblem*, which has sorely puzzled the commentators, occurs. Probably a girdle.

allowed near the altar. The hours of service to be noted by ringing bells. Priests always to wear stoles, even when not officiating. In church services the same use to be observed by all, and an equal pace to be kept. The priests are to instruct the youth diligently, and preach to the people every Sunday, and distribute the alms of the people. They are to beware of over-drinking, not to be common rhymers or musicians, not to swear, nor to love too much the company of women,[1] nor to bear false witness, nor to be accomplices with a thief, nor to decline ordeal or the oath. Priests are not to be hunters or hawkers, or players of dice, but to "divert themselves with their book." They are to teach those who confess penance and satisfaction, to housel sick men, and anoint them if they desire it; to see that due respect is paid to the corpse; to have oil ready for baptism and anointing; and when the chrism is fetched from the bishop, to give an account how these laws have been observed.[2]

17. Besides these canons, there was a body of penitential canons passed about this time, which present some features worth noting. They commence with a form of confession. Confession is ordained to be made to the bishop sitting in his episcopal chair on Ash Wednesday, then the fitting "satisfaction" is to be enjoined, and those who have performed it are to appear again before the bishop on the Thursday before Easter, who then will "sing over them and give them absolution."[3] Then follow the various satisfactions to be made for the various sins enumerated. As to these, it may be remarked that involuntary sin is treated as sin, though of a lesser heinousness, and also that the notion of making satisfaction or compensation for sin runs through the whole. Satisfaction for sin may be made by a layman if he "lay aside his weapons, and travel far away, and not be a second night in the same place, and fast and watch much, and

[1] It is very observable that in this code of minute laws for priests nothing is said against clerical marriage.

[2] Johnson, *English Canons*, i. 412-425.

[3] It is remarkable that the form of absolution given in the Penitential is precatory, not declaratory.

pray earnestly night and day, and wear woollen and be unshorn, so as that no iron come upon his head or nails, and come not into a warm bath, nor a soft bed, nor taste any flesh, nor anything that is intoxicating, nor come within a church (though he zealously inquire after holy places), and declare his guilt, and earnestly beg prayers for himself, and kiss nobody, but be always vehemently bewailing his sins." But, on the other hand, "much satisfaction may be redeemed by alms-deeds," by building churches and giving to the poor; and in fact there follows (Canon 72) a scheme by which fasting may be redeemed. One day's fasting may be redeemed with a penny, a year's with thirty shillings, or with freeing a slave that is worth that money; or, again, seven years' fasting may be redeemed in twelve months by singing every day a psalter of psalms; or twelve days may be redeemed by a mass. Another plan is also proposed (Canon 74):—"A very wealthy man, or one that abounds in friends, may make his satisfaction much more easy by the assistance of his friends." If he has seven years' fast to perform, he may procure seven times a hundred and twenty men to fast for him three days, "then are there as many fasts kept as there are fasts in seven years" (Canon 75). "This is that softening of penance which belongs to wealthy men and such as abound in friends; but one in a lower condition cannot make such despatch, but therefore he must pursue it in his own person with the greater earnestness. And it is most righteous that every one revenge his own crimes upon himself by diligent satisfaction; for it is written, 'Every one shall bear his own burden.'" The text quoted comes in, it must be confessed, with rather a singular effect after the provisions detailed above for getting the burden borne by others.[1]

[1] Johnson's *English Canons*, i. 426-449.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

THE EARLY LIFE OF DUNSTAN.

DUNSTAN was a native of Wessex, the son of Heorstan and Cynedrida, who lived near Glastonbury, and the nephew of Athelm, Archbishop of Canterbury. He was born in 925, and, when a child, placed in the school of Glastonbury, where he made extraordinary progress. He was of a feeble habit of body, and when a child, suffered from a fever, during the delirium of which he escaped from his nurses and mounted to the roof of the abbey church, going up and descending without accident. This was thought to be miraculous. From Glastonbury, after finishing his education there, he went to Canterbury to his uncle Athelm, who soon after his arrival presented him to King Athelstan. His beauty, engaging manners, and literary accomplishments, made him a great favourite at court. He was highly skilled in music, and played well on the harp and other instruments. This excited jealousy among the courtiers, and Dunstan was accused of various crimes. He retired from Court to the house of another uncle Alfheh, bishop of Winchester, but the malice of his persecutors followed him. Hired ruffians fell upon him, beat him severely, and threw him into a marshy pond. He succeeded in crawling out, but was then attacked by a pack of hungry dogs, from which he took refuge in a peasant's hut. The dogs were afterwards thought to be demons in canine shape. At Winchester he fell in love with a young lady of great beauty, but his marriage was opposed by his uncle Alfheh, who wished him to become a monk. Dunstan fell into a grievous illness, and during his weakness was induced by the bishop to make a vow to become a monk. On his recovery he built himself a little cell close to the church of Winchester, in which he constantly lived, occupied with devotions and with the cultivation of various arts, such as working in metal and illuminating manuscripts. He believed himself constantly assaulted by devils, and to this period of his life belongs the legend of his having caught the devil by the nose with a pair of red-hot pincers. King Edmund called Dunstan from his cell (soon after 940), and made him one of his counsellors, and the abbot of Glastonbury. He introduced into the abbey the strict discipline of the Continental monks, and expelled the secular clergy, who had before occupied the abbey, and by whom he himself had been taught. The remainder of his life is closely connected with the general history of the country.—*Biographia Britannica*, Wright.

CHAPTER IX.

PERIOD OF THE DANISH ASCENDENCY.

988–1042.

1. Disastrous character of the period. 2. Ælfric. 3. Ælfric's Canons. 4. His exhortation to the priests. 5. He succeeds Sigeric at Canterbury. 6. Elphege made Archbishop. 7. Canons of the Council of Eynsham. 8. Murder of Archbishop Elphege. 9. The Council of Habam. 10. Accession of the Danish Prince Cnut. 11. Troubles of the period. 12. Cnut's religious benefactions. 13. Cnut's laws ecclesiastical. 14. Consecration of the church at Assandun. 15. Ethelnoth, Archbishop of Canterbury. 16. Letter of King Cnut from Rome. 17. He upholds both Regulars and Seculars. 18. Scandals among the bishops.

1. THE prophecy said to have been made by Dunstan that under the reign of Ethelred "such evils should fall upon the English as they had never yet suffered," was entirely fulfilled. From almost the beginning of Ethelred's reign (979) to the death of Edmund Ironside and the general acceptance of Cnut (1016), England was the constant scene of war and rapine. That which was even worse was that these wars were disgraced almost beyond example by the most revolting treachery, cowardice, and abasement; the only redeeming figures being those of the bold Edmund Ironside, and the grand and noble Elphege, Archbishop of Canterbury. During this period of anarchy and bloodshed but few events connected with ecclesiastical history are discoverable. It is probable that the monasteries refounded under Dunstan's influence were now of especial service to the Church, as offering somewhat of an asylum; the Danes, in this second period of their invasions, do not appear to have directed their attacks against them so persistently as in the first period. Probably the fact of so many of their countrymen being now settled in England

and professing Christianity may have deterred them from this, and doubtless many of the invaders were also of the same faith. It was perhaps also, in great measure, due to the timid counsels of the monks and clergy that the custom of buying off the invaders by enormous ransoms was adopted, and thus the Danes may have looked upon the clergy as their best allies.[1]

2. It is, however, at this period, when ecclesiastical events are rare, and instances of distinguished Churchmen difficult to discover, that we come upon the most distinctive and striking teaching that had appeared in the English Church since the days of Bede and Alcuin. The author of this was Ælfric, known as the "Grammarian" from his having composed a grammar, and who subsequently reached the rank of Archbishop of Canterbury.[2] The father of Ælfric was ealdorman of Kent. When young his education was entrusted to a secular priest, who was very ignorant, and scarcely knew Latin; hence Ælfric speaks with much contempt of this class of clergy. When Ethelwold at Abingdon opened a school, Ælfric became one of his scholars, and probably went with his master from Abingdon to Winchester. From thence he was sent (about 988 or 989) to govern the newly founded abbey of Cerne in Dorsetshire, at the instance of the ealdorman Ethelmer. It was at the request of Ethelmer and his son Ethelward, that Ælfric wrote his large collection of Anglo-Saxon homilies, made his translation of Genesis, and his abridgment of the Rule of Ethelwold.[3] This last was

[1] "This counsel first advised Archbishop Sigeric."—A.-S. Chron., *s. a.* 991.

[2] There were two, perhaps three, Ælfrics contemporary, and great confusion has arisen between them. That the writer of the canons and homilies was the Archbishop of Canterbury, is, I think, well shown by Dr. Hook (*Archbishops*, i. 435). Mr. Baron, however, thinks that he was the Archbishop of York (Johnson's *Canons*, i. 387). A further difficulty arises from Ælfric's describing himself as a *monk* in the preface to the homilies, when it is known that he succeeded Siric as bishop of Ramsbury. But it is probable, as suggested by Mr. Wright (*Hist. Lit.*, 483), that there was an interval of vacancy in the See of Ramsbury or Wilton between Siric and Ælfric.

[3] For a fuller list of the writings of Ælfric see Notes and Illustrations to this Chapter.

done for the direction of the monks of Eynsham, of whom he had been made the abbot. It was probably some time in 994 that Ælfric was made bishop of Ramsbury. He now joined with Wulfsine, bishop of Sherborne, in a vigorous attempt to reform his clergy, and to drive out the secular priests. With this view he composed and addressed to Wulfsine a body of canons, which are in many ways remarkable.[1]

3. The canons are addressed to Wulfsine by a "humble brother," who declares that he has not written anything as to the episcopal office, as Wulfsine well knows its duties, but for the clergy, "whose negligence and perverseness require to be reproved." He has written in English, according to Wulfsine's desire, that the clergy may understand. The document then begins in a severe tone: "I tell you, priests, that I will not bear your neglect of your ministry; and I tell you in good sooth how the matter stands with priests. Christ established Christianity and charity, and all that went with Him in His way forsook every worldly thing, and the company of their wives; therefore He Himself said in His gospel, 'He that hateth not his wife is not a minister worthy of Me.'" At the great Synod at Nice the liturgy of the Church was established, and the mass creed, and it was decreed that neither bishop, priest, nor deacon should retain any women in his house but mother, sister, or aunt. "This seems strange to you to hear, for ye have so brought your wretched doings into fashion, as if there were no danger of a priest's living like a married man."[2] "But the holy men of old lived without wives. You say that St. Peter had a wife, but this was under the law; he left his wife under the gospel.[3] So the priests under the old law might marry, but they had not to say mass." The same synod forbids any to be made priest who had married a widow, or who was married for

[1] Wright, *Hist. Lit.*, art. "Alfric."

[2] If these canons are to be dated 994 (and not 957, as Johnson), it would seem that the movement against the married clergy under Dunstan had not had much success.

[3] It seems, however, that he still "led her about." The Bishop presumes on a considerable ignorance of his clergy.

the second time; nor may priests attend a wedding where a man marries a second time. The writer then gives the seven orders appointed in the Church—viz. ostiary, lector, exorcist, acolyth, sub-deacon, deacon, presbyter—and explains their offices. The ostiary is to attend to the church doors and the bells; the lector to read the Scriptures in the church; the exorcist to adjure malignant spirits to depart out of men; the acolyth to hold the taper when the Gospel is read or the housel hallowed, to signify bliss, and to the honour of Christ who is our light; sub-deacon to bring the vessels to the deacon, and to minister under the deacon about the vessels of the altar; deacon to place the oblations on the altar, to read the Gospel at the mass—he may also baptize children and housel the people—he must be clothed in a white alb; the priest hallows the housel, and preaches to and instructs the people. "There is no more between a bishop and a priest, but that the bishop is appointed to ordain, and to bishop children, and to hallow churches, and to take care of God's rights."[1] These are the only orders, monkship and abbotship are of "another sort." "Mass priests and all God's servants are to keep their churches employed with divine service. Let them sing therein the seven tide-songs that are appointed them, viz. the uht-song (matins), the prime-song, the undern-song (tierce), the midday-song, the noon-song (none), the even-song, and the night-song (compline); and they shall pray devoutly for the king, and for their bishops, and for all Christian people.[2] And the mass priest shall procure the furniture for his ghostly work before he be ordained—that is, the holy books, the Psalter, and the Pistol Book, Gospel Book, and Mass Book, the Song Book (Antiphonary), and the Hand Book (Manual), the Calendar, the Passional,[3] the Penitential,[4] and the Lesson Book." The priest must also have his "mass-vestment, that he may reverently

[1] This refusing to recognise bishops as a separate *order* is remarkable at this date.

[2] It is observable that there is no mention of the Pope.

[3] Martyrology, containing the accounts of the sufferings of the saints.

[4] Directing the special penance for each sin.

minister to God, as is becoming, and his altar-cloth well made. Let his chalice, likewise, be made of pine wood,[1] not subject to rottenness, and also the paten; and let the corporal be clean, so as befits Christ's ministration." "The mass priest on Sundays and mass days shall speak the sense of the gospel to the people in English, and of the paternoster and the creed as oft as he can, for the inciting of the people to know their belief and retain their Christianity." Tithes are to be brought into the church, and divided into three parts—one for the repair of the church, one for the poor, a third for the ministers. Mass is not to be celebrated in any house except one that is hallowed, save in cases of necessity from sickness. If unbaptized children be brought to the priest, he must baptize them at once. No ministrations are to be sold for money, nor must the priest remove himself for gain from one minster to another. Priests are not to get drunk, nor to be much given to drink, nor to trade, nor wear arms, nor plead causes, nor frequent taverns, nor swear oaths. They must with discretion enjoin penance, housel the sick, and anoint them, as enjoined by St. James. There have been four great Synods of the Church, which are to be regarded as "the four books of Christ in His Church. Many synods have been holden since, but yet these are of the greatest authority. How dare you overlook all these decrees?" The monks are obliged to observe the rule of St. Benedict. "Ye also have your rule, if ye would read it. But ye affect secular judicatures, and choose to be reeves, and abandon your churches." But we will remind you of your duties. "Christians ought to frequent the church, but men ought not to prate or dispute there, because it is the house of prayer, hallowed to God for ghostly speech. Nor ought men to drink or eat intemperately in God's house,[2] which is hallowed to this purpose, that the body of God may be there eaten with faith. Yet men often act so absurdly as to sit up at night and drink to madness within God's house, and to defile it with scandalous games and

[1] In other canons wooden chalices are forbidden.

[2] This implies rather a singular state of things as regards the use of churches.

lewd discourse. . . . Ye ought not to make merry over dead men, nor to hunt after a corpse, except ye are invited to it; when ye are invited, forbid the heathenish songs of laymen, and their obstreperous ejaculations. Do not yourselves eat and drink where the corpse lies, lest ye become imitators of the heathenish superstition which they then practise. Ye ought not to be gorgeously dressed with rings, nor let your garment be made in too gorgeous, nor yet in too sordid a manner; but let every one wear what belongs to his order; the priest that to which he was ordained, nor let him wear a monk's shroud, nor that which belongs to laymen, any more than a man wears the woman's attire. Christ saith of His ministers who serve Him that they shall always be with Him in bliss, where He Himself is in life truly so called. To Him be glory for ever and ever. Amen."[1]

4. To this document, called Canons, but more properly described as an Episcopal Charge, there is an exhortation to the priests when they come, as was the custom, on Maunday Thursday, to fetch the holy oil for baptism and extreme unction during the following year. It is interesting, as illustrating the ecclesiastical customs of the day. Housel, it is said, must not be hallowed on Good Friday,[2] but service must be said with adoration and kissing of the Rood. Then the priest must go to the altar with the remains of the housel hallowed on Thursday, and with unhallowed wine mingled with water, and cover them with a corporal, and say certain prayers. Then let him put a particle of the housel into the chalice in silence. Then let him go to housel, and whoever else pleases. Then special directions follow as to the services on Maunday Thursday, Good Friday, and Easter Eve. It is wrong to reserve the housel hallowed at Easter for the sick throughout the whole year. This is wrong, as it causes the holy housel to putrefy. It ought not to be allowed to get stale, but to be hallowed for the sick about every fortnight. The housel hallowed to-day is as good as that hallowed at Easter, for

[1] Johnson's *English Canons*, i. 388-403.

[2] Called here Long Friday. It is supposed on account of the length of the services.

"that housel is Christ's body, not corporally, but spiritually; not the body in which He suffered, but that Body of which He spake when He blessed bread and wine for housel one night before His passion, and said of the bread blessed, 'This is My Body;' and again of the wine blessed, 'This is My Blood, which is shed for many, for the forgiveness of sins.' Know now that the Lord who was able to change the bread into His body before His passion, and the wine into His blood, in a spiritual manner, He Himself daily blesseth bread and wine by the hands of His priests, into His spiritual body and blood."[1] The priest ought to have clean hands as well as heart, to take care that the oblation be properly baked, and to mingle water with the wine. On account of the attention needed for the offering, none ought to celebrate mass who is defective in his sight. The chalice ought never to be used for any other purpose. The four days after Easter are to be kept as feasts. The Sunday feast is to be from Saturday noon to Monday's light. All appointed feasts and fasts to be observed. Every Friday is a fast, save those which fall between Easter and Pentecost, and between Christmas and

[1] This passage has been often quoted and referred to, to show that the writer did not hold the doctrine of Transubstantiation in the sense of the modern Romanists. The Homily of Ælfric for Easter states the same doctrine more at length. "Great is the difference between the body in which Christ suffered and that which is hallowed for housel. . . . His ghostly body, which we call housel, is gathered of many corns without blood and bone, limbless and soulless, and there is therein nothing to be understood bodily, but all is to be understood spiritually." Now, as the Homilies of Ælfric had the authoritative approval of Archbishop Sigeric, it seems not unfair to assert that this was the doctrine of the English Church of his time. Dr. Lingard, however, asserts that this language was novel, and that nothing like it is to be met with in any Anglo-Saxon writer who lived either before or after Ælfric (ii. 314). Yet Osbern, in the *Life of Archbishop Odo*, says, "Hoc ferme tempore quidam clerici maligno errore seducti, asseverare conabantur panem et vinum quæ in altari ponuntur post consecrationem in priori substantiâ permanere, et figuram tantummodo esse corporis et sanguinis Christi, non verum Christi corpus et sanguinem."—Osbern, *Vit. Odonis*, *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 82.

a seven-night after Epiphany, and those on which a feast is appointed; also the days before the mass days of St. Mary and the mass days of the Apostles; and the mass *contra paganos* is to be sung every Wednesday.[1]

5. In the year 995 died Siric, Archbishop of Canterbury. He is said by Gervase to have left books to the cathedral; and he certainly gave his sanction and acceptance to the Homilies of Ælfric. He is, however, best known as having suggested or supported the fatal policy of the Danish tribute. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle supplies some interesting details as to the choice of the bishop to succeed him. "Ælfric, bishop of Wiltshire, was chosen on Easter day (April 21), by King Ethelred, and by all his 'Witan.' This Ælfric was a very wise man, so that there was no more sagacious man in England.[2] Then went Ælfric to his archiepiscopal See, and when he came thither, he was received by those men in orders, who of all were most distasteful to him, that is by clerks." He immediately instituted an inquiry into the ancient condition of the See, and sent for all the wisest men that he knew, that both by their testimony and his own, the king and the Witan might be convinced that in the old times there were monks at Canterbury, and not clerks. The king was convinced, but desired that Ælfric should have the Pope's sanction before making any changes. The clerks getting to hear of this, and taking the alarm, sent in all haste two of their number to Rome to offer the Pope a large sum, if he would grant them the pall to convey to the new archbishop; which would give them the opportunity of making terms with him. But the Pope would not do this, as the clerks "had brought no letter either from the king or from the people," but sent them away. Then the archbishop came, and was received at Rome with great honour, and commanded to

[1] Johnson, *Eng. Canons*, i. 403-407. In addition to this the Capitula of Bishop Théodulf, of Orleans, in the eighth century, were translated into English by Ælfric, for the use of his clergy.—Johnson, i. 452-479.

[2] The learning of Ælfric is testified to by the monk Bridferth, in his dedication to Ælfric of his Life of St. Dunstan, "*ob enormitatem divulgatæ peritiæ.—Mem. Dunstan, ap. init.*

celebrate mass at St. Peter's altar; and the Pope himself put on him the pall, and the matter of the clerks having been discussed between them, the Pope authorised Ælfric to turn them out of the monastery, and to "put in men of that order which the blessed Gregory commanded Augustine therein to place." The archbishop returned and "occupied the archiepiscopal chair," and then went to Canterbury, and, with the consent of the king and the people, "drove the clerks out of the monastery, and therein placed monks, all as the Pope had commanded him."[1] Thus the secular canons of Christ Church, who had been introduced by Archbishop Ceolnoth on account of the scarcity of monks, and who had contrived to hold their own throughout the period of Dunstan's influence, were at length ejected in favour of men of the character of the original occupants of Christ Church. Monachism, under Ethelred and Ælfric, may be considered to have finally gained the triumph over the secular clergy. But this new movement lasted only as long as the supremacy of the family of Edgar. The Danish kings who succeeded, as more practical men, founded colleges.[2]

6. It was during the occupancy by Ælfric of the See of Canterbury (1002), that the horrors of St. Brice's day were enacted, and the unsuspecting Danes were massacred by the command of Ethelred. He also witnessed the terrible miseries brought on the land by the avenging army of Sweyne. It was reserved, however, for one who had already gained the character of a saint by his asceticism and devotion, to illustrate, by a striking example, the yet untamed ferocity of the Danes, and the Christian courage which could animate one whose life was devoted to God. Elphege had been taken from a Benedictine monastery to be bishop of Winchester, and though strongly opposed by the secular clergy, had yet gained the admiration of all by his devotion and alms-deeds. In 1006, on the death of Ælfric, he was, with the applause of all the nation, translated to Canterbury.[3] Even the troublous times on which

[1] Anglo-Saxon Chron., *s.a.* 995.

[2] Stubbs, Introduction to *Epp. Cant.*, p. xix.

[3] Hook, i. 463. There is a Life of Elphege, by Osbern, printed in *Anglia Sacra*, vol. ii.

he had fallen could not excuse the new Primate from the journey to Rome for the pall. His first act on his return was to unite with the Archbishop of York in inducing King Ethelred to summon a council. Accordingly, a general assembly of the great men of the kingdom was held at Eynsham, in Oxfordshire, in the year 1007, or somewhat later. At this council, which had the character of a Witenagemot, both secular and ecclesiastical laws were passed. An earnest religious spirit seems to have pervaded the assembly. "The bishops, with mutual instructions, exhorted each other in their wholesome discourses to adorn themselves with comeliness of faith, hope, and charity, and of the four principal virtues, viz. prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance; and they appointed a daily mutual intercession, and faithfully confirmed a league of peace and concord between themselves."[1]

7. The character of the laws enacted at Eynsham is decidedly mild. Monks are exhorted to observe chastity, the wearing of the habit, and to serve God "in the best manner that they can." Priests are to consider that they cannot "lawfully cohabit with a wife."[2] If they will "desist from this," an "addition of worldly honour" is promised them. "They shall be equal to a thane, both as to their weregild, their rights in lifetime, and burial." Churches are declared to be under special protection, and no man can bring a church into servitude, or make merchandise of it, or turn out a "church-thane," without the bishop's consent.[3] Tithes are to be duly paid, "that is, plough alms, fifteen nights after Easter at farthest; tithe of young, at Pentecost; and of all fruits of the earth, by All-hallow's mass; and the Rome-fee, by Peter's mass; and the church-scot, at Martin's mass; and the light-scot, thrice a year; and the soul-scot, at the open grave." Feasts and fasts are to be strictly observed;

[1] Johnson, *Eng. Can.*, i. 481.

[2] Yet, says the canon, "Some have two or more, and some, though they dismiss her whom they formerly had, afterward take another, the former living."

[3] This limitation of the rights of patrons, preventing them from "making merchandise" of their churches, is observable.

Ember-days and Fridays as fasts; and Lent made to extend from Septuagesima till the fifteenth night after Easter. Intermixed with these religious laws are provisions for a universal coinage, for the preparation of the fleet, and against desertion from the army, and many earnest exhortations to good living are joined.[1] "The circumstances of the country," says Dr. Hook, "rendered the meeting peculiarly solemn."[2]

8. A terrible proof indeed was now to be given of the insecurity which encompassed even the greatest and best of those assembled at Eynsham. The plundering bands of Danes, unchecked by the feeble resistance of the English, marched as they pleased across the land, robbing, burning, and murdering. In 1011 they were before Canterbury. They had threatened the city before, but had been bought off by money. Now they had returned, determined to wring the very last penny from the dignitaries of the metropolitan church. The archbishop, though entreated to fly, refused to do so. He exhorted the citizens to fight like men, and for twenty days they kept the foe at bay. Each soldier, as he went to the ramparts, repaired first to the cathedral, where the Primate was ready to bless and housel him. But on the twentieth day a traitor, said to have been an abbot, enabled the enemy to enter.[3] He set fire to a portion of the city, and while the garrison rushed to extinguish it, he opened the gates of the undefended part. Then ensued one of the most terrible scenes ever recorded. The outrage, torture, and murder of women and children were carried on amidst fiendish laughter and mockery. The archbishop appealed to the murderers by their manhood not to make war upon infants. He was seized and carried to see his cathedral in flames, and to witness the devilish sport in which the Danes indulged of cutting down the unfortunate monks and priests as they

[1] Johnson's *Eng. Canons*, i. 482-493. [2] *Archbishops*, i. 464.

[3] Ælfmaer, abbot of Canterbury. It is observable that Osbern in his Life of Elphege, says nothing of the traitor. As he was a Canterbury monk, he may have desired to screen his memory. The A.-S. Chronicle says, "Ælfmaer betrayed it, whose life the Archbishop Ælfeah had before saved."

rushed from the burning pile. Some were spared to be sold as slaves, or ransomed at large sums. Among these latter was the archbishop, whose ransom was fixed at 3000 pieces of silver. The archbishop refused to use the revenues of the Church for ransoming himself. He was then bound in chains and carried along with the marauding army when they quitted Canterbury. For seven months he was led about by them, and it is said that during that period he converted many of the Danes to Christianity. At length the patience of his captors was exhausted. They demanded the payment within eight days. The archbishop still resolutely refused. Then, at one of their drunken orgies at Greenwich, the leaders of the army sent for the archbishop, to amuse themselves with threatening and insulting him. "Money! money!" they shouted. The Primate with true dignity refused to gratify them, but exhorted them to repentance. Then some one threw an ox bone at the venerable speaker. Amidst a shout of laughter the example was generally followed. Elphege was knocked down wounded and bleeding. A friendly Dane clove his skull with a battle-axe, and ended his sufferings.[1] The Danes, struck with somewhat of contrition for the murder, allowed the body of the Primate to be honourably interred at London. It was afterwards brought in state by a Danish king to its final home at Canterbury.

9. The heroic fortitude of Elphege contrasts strongly with the timidity displayed by his successor Lyfing, a monk of Glastonbury, who, in terror of the Danes, fled away from England. These savage invaders were everywhere triumphant. Ethelred fled to Normandy, from whence, upon the death of Sweyne, he was recalled by the English Witan, who declared that "no lord could be dearer to them than their natural lord, if he would rule them better than before."[2] This Ethelred undertook to do. He returned, bringing with him the archbishop, and in order to inaugurate an improved administration, held a council at Habam (1014), where certain religious laws were passed. The first of these orders attention to religious duties and

[1] A.-S. Chron., *s. a.* 1012 ; Osbern, *Vita et Martyrium S. Elphegii*, *Ang. Sac.*, vol. ii. 134-142.

[2] A.-S. Chron. *s. a.* 1014.

the payment of tithes. The second orders a special fast, with processions, confession of sins, and satisfaction on the three days before the Feast of St. Michael next ensuing.[1] The third charges every congregation to have a mass sung daily for the king, and in convents the inmates are to sing, "with their limbs extended on the earth," the psalm "Lord, how are they increased that trouble me," during the present troubles, and to use the "Collect against the pagans," and to celebrate thirty masses for the king and people, and every monk is to sing thirty psalters. The fifth forbids selling men for slaves. The fourth and seventh reiterate directions as to church-dues and tithes. The eighth gives directions for the office of a judge, forbids bribes, directs care to be taken as to the appointment of deputies, orders the judge to be calm and patient, and no respecter of persons.[2]

10. The religious preparations thus made for a struggle against the Danes were accompanied by a greater display of valour and conduct than the English had previously shown. The gallant citizens of London again and again foiled the attacks of the enemy, and Edmund Ironside, a true hero, made so determined a stand that Cnut, the Danish king, agreed to divide the land between them. But on St. Andrew's Day (1016) King Edmund died, and thus Cnut became ruler of the whole land. It was now to be seen how the Church of England would fare under one who, though he himself had embraced Christianity, nevertheless inherited all the savage traditions and ferocious nature of the race from which he sprang.

11. From almost the commencement of the reign of Ethelred (981) down to the accession of Cnut to the whole kingdom (1017)—a period of thirty-six years—England had been harassed, distracted, and convulsed by a constant series of wars, rapines, burnings, and murders. The Primate

[1] It is supposed that this was done in imitation of what had been done in Apulia, where a signal victory was obtained by the Christians over the Northmen, owing, as was believed, to the aid of St. Michael. There was then a feast of St. Michael on May 8, as well as on September 29. The former of these days is supposed to be here intended. —Johnson's *Eng. Canons*, i. 496. [2] Johnson, *Eng. Can.*, i. 495-500.

of the Church had been foully slain; many clergy and monks had perished.[1] Some parts of the country had altogether lost their Christian organisation. The period had been marked by the constant recurrence of treachery of the most hideous character. The repeated treasons of Edric, the massacre of St. Brice, the mutilations of hostages by the Danish princes, all invest it with a peculiar horror. It may be assumed that if external religion were almost extinguished, internal religion and morality had fared even worse. "The traffic in human beings had become an important branch of commerce. What has been rarely known among the debased negro tribes—brother sold brother, the father his son, the son his mother! Terror of the ferocious Northmen had deadened every energy."[2] From this miserable condition the Church and country began to recover immediately after the accession of Cnut. He from whose savage youth the worst auguries might have been drawn, nevertheless proved himself a tender and prudent guardian of the Church, and a friend to its best interests. The reign of Cnut commences with murders and banishments, but no sooner is he firmly seated on the throne than a remarkable change takes place. "The stern warrior appears from this time as a provident and wise ruler, capable of valuing and promoting and profiting by all the blessings of peace."[3] Cnut was a nominal Christian when he succeeded to the throne. He soon shows himself to be an earnest promoter of Christianity. "The society which is unable to withstand his arms almost immediately humanises and elevates him."[4]

12. The most obvious and the most likely form for the awakened religious feeling of a prince of battles and murders to take (especially at a time when the idea of *satisfaction* was the one most prominent religious idea) was that of

[1] For the most part the Danes, in this second period of invasions, appear to have chosen to extort money from the monasteries under threats rather than destroy the monasteries. See the account given in the Chronicle of Croyland, attributed to Ingulph, but written in the thirteenth or fourteenth century. This chronicle, though tainted by the fictitious name of its author, was yet doubtless compiled from original materials.

[2] Lappenberg, ii. 179.

[3] *Ib.*, ii. 201.

[4] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 243.

building churches and religious houses. Accordingly, William of Malmesbury says of Cnut, "The monasteries throughout the whole of England, which had been either violated or overthrown in either his own or his father's wars, he restored; all the places in which his battles had been fought, and especially Aschendun,[1] he decorated with churches, and appointed to them ministers who, throughout all succeeding ages, might make supplication to God for the souls of those who were there slain. Over the body of St. Edmund, whom an earlier generation of Danes had slain, he built a church with a royal spirit, placed there an abbot and monks, conferred upon it many farms and mighty ones, and such was the amplitude of his gifts that at this day it can look down upon almost all the monasteries of England."[2] He conciliated the Pope by the restoration of St. Peter's penny, and gratified the English clergy by bestowing Danish bishoprics upon some of them. The priests chosen for these Sees were consecrated by Ethelnoth, Archbishop of Canterbury, who grounded upon this a claim for supremacy over the Scandinavian Church. He was, however, stoutly resisted in this by Unwan, Archbishop of Hamburg, and Cnut was obliged to uphold the authority of the latter.[3]

13. But Cnut's care for the Church was not confined to its outward organisation or its temporal possessions. At some period during his reign a number of ecclesiastical laws were passed in the Witans convened by him. During the

[1] Assingdon in Essex, the place where he had gained so decided a victory over Edmund. "This was for the Danes what half a century later Hastings was for the Normans."—Lappenberg, ii. 192. "According to one account," says Mr. Freeman, "not Assandun only but all his battlefields were marked by commemorative churches. But as Assandun was Cnut's only undoubted victory on English soil, and as men do not usually commemorate their defeats, we may conclude that Assandun was his only foundation of the kind."—*Norman Conquest*, i. 485.

[2] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Reg.* (Saville), p. 41. It is remarkable that Cnut not only enriched English monasteries, but also did the same in France and Germany. St. Omer's, Chartres, Bremen, and Cologne received substantial benefactions from him.—Lappenberg, ii. 204.

[3] See Lappenberg, ii. 205.

Heptarchic period ecclesiastical councils, as instituted by Theodore, were frequent, though from these the lay element was not excluded, and "they are scarcely distinguishable from the separate Witenagemots." But after the Danish troubles such councils are hardly to be found. Church laws are now passed by the Witenagemot, in which there always existed a strong ecclesiastical element. "No jealousy as yet existed between the two systems;"[1] no plainly marked distinction, in fact, between the secular and ecclesiastical was perceived. It seemed as obvious a thing that King Cnut should make "laws ecclesiastical" as laws civil. In an ancient collection of these former which has been got together, the first commands the love of God and the king; the second enacts the sacredness of the Church as a sanctuary for criminals; the third has the curious declaration that all churches are not equally potent as sanctuaries. There are "head churches," for violating which the fine is to be two hundred and forty shillings; "middling churches," the sanctity of which is valued at one hundred and twenty shillings; "lesser churches, which have a burying-place, but where little service is done," for which the fine is sixty shillings; and "country churches, where there is no burying place," for violating which the fine is only thirty shillings. The next laws, after describing the exalted dignity of a priest, enact how he is to make purgation by ordeal when accused of a crime. The purgation of the priest was to be by the housel—that is, if he denied his guilt and celebrated mass upon that denial, he was to be held free; but if there was a triple accusation against him—that is, an accusation by three persons—then he was to get two other priests to be compurgators with him. But if he could not find any friends ready to imperil their souls for his truth, he was "to go to Corsned"—that is, to put a piece of bread and cheese in his mouth, praying that it might choke him if he was guilty.[2] In the sixth canon the clergy are exhorted to godly living and to obeying their rule—"Let them know full well that they cannot of right converse with women in a carnal manner, and let him that will desist from this and

[1] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 230-2.

[2] See Johnson's *Eng. Canons*, i. 504, and *Notes*.

preserve chastity find mercy with God, and for his worldly worship be worthy of the right of a thane." The seventh law forbids marriages within the sixth degree of relationship, and with "the kin of a former wife," and with sureties at baptism, a consecrated nun, or a divorced woman. The laws as to Church dues and fees are almost identical with those in the laws of King Edgar, as also those for the fasts and feasts. "St. Edward's[1] mass-day" is declared to be appointed by the Witan as a mass-day for all England. The laws then assume the character rather of a sermon than a code, earnestly pressing upon men Christian lives, bidding them go to housel three times a year at least, and to learn well Paternoster and Credo, exhorting the clergy as shepherds to care for their sheep, and provide them with wise instructions.[2] In another collection of Cnut's "laws ecclesiastical" one enactment forbids any man being sold as a slave *into a heathen country*, lest his soul should perish. But the selling of a slave to Christians is not forbidden. Offenders against the laws are in this code somewhat strangely called upon to *desist*, instead of penalties being fixed for their misdeeds. A law of King Edgar, which bids the bishop sit on the bench with the ealdorman, is repeated. The priest is here called an "altar thane." The Sunday is guarded from work by severe penalties. No executions are to take place on Sundays. By the 29th law it is enacted that "all people ought of right to assist in repairing the church."[3] This code also ends with a devout exhortation to religious obedience and holy living.[4]

14. The very strong religious tone which is apparent in the laws of King Cnut was not contradicted by or opposed to his way of life. His rule was just and equitable. "The forsaken fields were cultivated anew, fortresses, bridges, and roads restored, churches and chapels erected. Neither against the king nor his officials has one complaint on the part of the Anglo-Saxons reached us."[5] Connected with his zealous building of churches before mentioned, the con-

[1] That is, the young king who was slain by his stepmother in 978.
[2] Johnson, *English Canons*, i. 501-511.
[3] This is probably the earliest institution of church-rate.
[4] Johnson, *English Canons*, i. 512-520. [5] Lappenberg, ii. 208.

secration of the church at Assandun, built in commemoration of his great victory, is worthy of notice. The church had been built in partnership with Thurkill as earl of the district, and as Cnut's chief comrade in the battle ; and it was consecrated in 1020, in the presence of the king and the earl, by Wulfstan, Archbishop of York, and several other bishops. The church was built of stone, though that material was not easily to be found in the neighbourhood. It was wanting, however, in grand proportions, and was only founded for a single priest ; and it is remarkable that Stigand, afterwards so prominent a figure as Archbishop of Canterbury, was the first priest of Assandun.[1]

15. The employment of the Archbishop of York in the consecration of Assandun was due probably to the fact that the primacy was at the moment vacant, Archbishop Lyfing having died in this year.[2] The most notable matter recorded in connection with this prelate is that he declined to go to Rome for the pall ; and as this ornament was now only granted on a personal application, the archbishop never obtained it.[3] The prelate who succeeded him was of a higher cast. Ethelnoth, called by the chroniclers "*Dean* of Christ Church,"[4] was originally a Benedictine of Glastonbury, that famous abbey which gave no less than seven primates to the English Church before the Conquest.[5] Ethelnoth, as president of the Canterbury monks, was brought into contact with Cnut, who learnt to respect his character and opinion, and to be influenced by his advice. When the See of Canterbury fell vacant, Cnut nominated Ethelnoth to it (without, apparently, referring at all to the chapter),

[1] Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, i. 471.

[2] A.-S. Chron., *s. a.* 1020. [3] Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops*, i. 476.

[4] "From 1012 to 1070 a curious compromise between theory and fact seems to have prevailed [at Christ Church]. The church was a monastery, and the inmates bore the name of monks ; but they did not keep the monastic rule, and, moreover, assumed the titles of a secular chapter. Their president was called a dean ; the monks were also cathedral canons."—Stubbs, *Introd. to Ep. Cant.*, p. 24.

[5] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Reg.*, p. 42 (ed. Saville). The archbishops were Brihtwald, Athelm, Dunstan, Ethelgar, Siric, Elphege, and Ethelnoth

and issued his letters patent to Wulfstan, Archbishop of York, to consecrate him. This was done as the king desired, and Ethelnoth afterwards proceeded to Rome to obtain the pall. On his way home, at Pavia, he considered himself fortunate in becoming the possessor of an (alleged) arm of St. Augustine at the price of a "hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold."[1] This costly relic he presented to Leofric, earl of Mercia, for the church at Coventry, which, in conjunction with the Lady Godiva, his wife, he had magnificently furnished. The devotion of the archbishop was imitated by Cnut, who visited Glastonbury with the archbishop, to do honour, as he said, to the place where "his brother's"[2] remains rested, and gave to the church a grand cope embroidered with the figures of peacocks in various colours.[3] Cnut also adorned and enriched the cathedral church of Canterbury.

16. The bearing of King Cnut towards the Church, and the effectual services which he rendered in raising it up after the long miseries of the Danish wars, may perhaps best be estimated by his letter, written after his pilgrimage to Rome.[4] "This," says an able writer, "is his best epitaph."[5] It certainly exhibits him not only as a devout worshipper, but as an able ruler, prudently providing for the best interests of the Church. He tells his people that he has undertaken his journey to Rome to pray for the forgiveness of his sins, and for the welfare of his people. He thanks God for allowing him to visit the sanctuary of the Apostles, especially as he believes that St. Peter has great power in binding and loosing.[6] He then describes the great assembly which had been held at Rome, at which the Emperor had been present and King Rodolph, and at which

[1] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Reg.*, p. 42.

[2] The body of Edmund Ironside was buried at Glastonbury. Cnut calls him his brother, as having been joint king with him.

[3] Will. Malmesb., *Ib.*

[4] The exact date of the Roman visit is uncertain. 1031 is the date usually adopted; but see Freeman (i. 479, Note 2), who adopts 1027.

[5] Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, i. 479.

[6] This is almost an exact parallel with what is attributed to Oswy, king of Northumbria, at the Synod of Whitby.

they had agreed to remove obstacles from the way of English pilgrims going to Rome. He says that he had expressed his "high displeasure" to the Pope at the immense sums of money exacted from his archbishops when they went to Rome to get the pallium, and it was promised that this should be no more done. He declares that he has humbly vowed to Almighty God to amend his life in all respects, to rule his people aright, to uphold strict justice, to enforce impartial law for rich and poor. He is going to Denmark to conclude a treaty of peace, then he hopes to return to England. He desires that before he comes all dues belonging to God be carefully paid, and the pence payable to St. Peter. Those who make default will be fined.[1]

17. On the matter which had caused so great excitement in the reigns of preceding English kings, the question between the regulars and seculars, it does not appear that King Cnut took a decided line either way.[2] Assandun, his chief, perhaps his only, new English establishment, was secular. On the other hand, when he rebuilt the minster of St. Edmund, and endowed it with such rich gifts, he turned out the secular canons who had before been attached to it, and planted there an abbot and monks. His benefactions were chiefly given to monasteries. St. Benet at Holm, Winchester, Ely, and Ramsey partook of his bounty. From the general fairness and breadth of his character, it may be assumed that merit, whether secular or regular, found in him a ready patron.

18. The eighteen years of the reign of Cnut were a time of growth and restoration, both for the ecclesiastical and civil interests of the country. During the period of the divided empire which followed his death, only signs of retrogression as regards Church matters can be perceived. We read of bishoprics being held in plurality and sold for money.[3] Archbishop Ethelnoth, who had been the friend

[1] Florent. Wigorn. *s. a.* 1031; Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Reg.*, (ed. Saville), 41.

[2] Mr. Freeman says, "He mainly but not exclusively favoured the monks."—*Conquest*, i. 484. Mr. Stubbs appears to favour the opposite view.—Introd. to *Epp. Cant.*, p. xix.

[3] Freeman, i. 563. Stigand was appointed to a bishopric, then

and counsellor of Cnut, and who is said to have refused to crown Harold, inasmuch as Cnut had willed the crown only to the children of Emma, died soon after his patron. He was succeeded by Eadsige, who had been a chaplain of Cnut, and who had been consecrated as coadjutor bishop by Ethelnoth during his lifetime, taking his title from the little church of St. Martin's at Canterbury, "in which Queen Bertha prayed and Luithard preached."[1] The new archbishop was not of the high character of the last; he is said to have been a time-server. He crowned Harold, which Ethelnoth had refused to do, but he was quite as ready to crown Edward, the son of Emma. The other Primate, Ælfric, Archbishop of York, obtained an evil notoriety by supporting the tyrannical proceedings of Harthacnut after the death of Harold. It was by his counsel, according to William of Malmesbury, that the corpse of Harold was disinterred and beheaded, and thrown into the Thames.[2] Ælfric also, by the aid of the evil king, seized the bishopric of Worcester, to which Lyfing had been appointed, but which had been held in plurality by the three preceding archbishops of York. Bishop Lyfing was beloved by the people of his diocese, being a friend and supporter of Earl Godwin, who was striving to uphold the liberties of his country against the Danish tyrant.[3] Archbishop Ælfric was violently forced into the diocese, but the people refusing to receive him, he induced the king to take a terrible vengeance upon them,—to burn and spoil the city of Worcester.[4] Another grievous scandal was witnessed in the north. Edmund, the second bishop of Durham, had succeeded in raising a minster over the bones of St. Cuthbert. In the year 1042 he died when at Gloucester with King Harthacnut, and Eadred, called by Simeon, "second in rank after the bishop," purchased the See of

deposed before consecration because some one else offered a larger sum.

[1] Hook, *Archbishops*, i. 488.

[2] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pont.*, 154 (ed. Saville).

[3] Freeman, i. 572.

[4] Willelm. Malmesb. Simeon Dunelm., p. 179 (Twysden). Bishop Lyfing was restored the next year, having found means to pacify (*serenare*) the king.

the king by great treasures taken from the coffers of the Church. The simoniac was, however, not allowed to take possession of his ill-gotten dignity. As he was about to enter the church, he was seized with a sudden malady, and died after lingering ten months.[1] In the midst of all these scandals of Church and State, it must have been a relief to all well-disposed folk when King Harthacnut died suddenly at a drinking bout in Lambeth, and "all the people received Edward for king, as was his natural right."[2]

[1] Simeon Dunelm., *Hist. Dunelm.*, p. 34 (ed. Twysden).
[2] Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, *s. a.*

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

THE WRITINGS OF ÆLFRIC.

The following is a list of the writings attributed to Ælfric taken from Mr. Wright's *Biographia Literaria.*

1. A Latin Grammar, being a translation of the old grammars of Donatus and Priscian, preceded by a Latin and Anglo-Saxon preface. 2. A Glossary of Latin words most commonly used in conversation. 3. A Colloquium or conversation in Latin, with an interlinear Saxon gloss. 4. An Anglo-Saxon Manual of Astronomy. 5. A collection of Homilies, amounting in number to eighty. "These sermons are translations and compilations from the Latin homilies which had long been used in the Anglo-Saxon Church; even the famous paschal sermon, in which the Anglo-Saxon doctrine of the Eucharist is stated, is in its more important part taken from the Latin of Ratramn." 6. Another set of Homilies compiled from the Latin, commemorative of the different saints revered by the Anglo-Saxon Church. 7. A translation of the Pentateuch and the Book of Job. 8. A Treatise on the Old and New Testament. 9. A Treatise on the Trinity. 10. The Abridgment of Ethelwolf's Constitutions for the monks of Eynsham. 11. [Perhaps] the Translation of the Life of Guthlac. 12. An Epistle to Sigferth on the marriage of the clergy. 13. [Probably] Sermo Ælfrici Episcopi ad Clericos. 14. Sermo ad Sacredotes.

CHAPTER X.

CONTEST BETWEEN NATIONAL AND FOREIGN INFLUENCE IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

1042-1066.

1. Good auguries for the Church in the accession of Edward. 2. His promotion of foreign prelates. 3. Stigand advanced to Winchester. 4. Leofric first bishop of Exeter. 5. Ulf bishop of Dorchester at Vercellæ. 6. Robert, Archbishop of Canterbury; foreign influence at its height. 7. Robert and Ulf expelled. 8. Stigand archbishop. 9. Herman bishop of Ramsbury, and the Malmesbury monks. 10. Earl Harold's foundation of Waltham. 11. Gisa bishop of Wells. 12. Ealdred's advancement to the See of York. 13. Wulfstan bishop of Worcester. 14. Building and consecration of Westminster Abbey. 15. Archbishop Stigand consecrates Harold.

1. THE restoration of the English family and of the line of Cedric and Ethelred, in the person of a prince renowned for his virtue, and especially for his devotion, gave promise of good days for the English Church. In the election and appointment of Edward, a bishop had borne a prominent part. Lyfing, bishop of Worcester, hardly used, as we have seen, by Harthacnut and Ælfric, had great influence in the land through his close connection with Earl Godwin. He had been favoured by King Cnut, and by him appointed to the Devonshire and Cornwall See,[1] the headquarters of which were then at Crediton. When appointed to Worcester he had not relinquished the western See, but had held it in plurality. There were many examples of this evil practice at that time, Worcester especially being a sort of appanage to York.[2] Lyfing,

[1] The See of Cornwall, the original of which was due to the ancient British Church, was united to that of Devonshire during the episcopate of Lyfing. Now, after more than eight hundred years, again happily dissevered.

[2] On the connection between Worcester and York, see Stubbs's *Const. Hist.*, i. 239, note.

known as "the eloquent," and admired as a true patriot bishop, must have had much power to commend the new king to Churchmen.[1] Edward was "hallowed" king at Winchester on Easter-day (1043) "with great worship," and Archbishop Eadsige "well instructed and exhorted him."[2] No better promise for the tranquillity and advancement of the Church could be given than in such a ruler so generally acceptable to the nation.

2. The one thing which to a great extent marred all these good hopes, was Edward's inveterate preference for foreigners, and his constant practice of putting foreign Churchmen into English Sees. Edward had spent his life in Normandy, and was more Norman than English. His great eagerness was to surround himself with Normans. But besides the Normans and Frenchmen brought over by him, there were many Germans or Lotharingians promoted in the Church at this time.[3] The Church of England thus gradually acquired a foreign complexion and foreign habits. Speaking of the Lotharingians, Mr. Freeman says, "If they were not Normanisers, they were at least Romanisers. They brought with them habits of constant reference to the Papal See, and a variety of scruples on points of small canonical regularity, to which Englishmen had hitherto been strangers."[4] Increased connection with the Continent meant, in fact, increased subordination to Rome. The *national* character of the Church of England was impaired. "We now first hear of bishops going to Rome for consecration or confirmation, and of the Roman court claiming at least a veto on the nomination of the English king."[5] Robert of Jumiéges, a Norman monk, made bishop of London, becomes the great adviser and director of the king. What the Church gains in tranquillity and in royal favour she loses in nationality and freedom.

3. The man destined to take the most prominent stand

[1] See Freeman, ii. 82, and the quotations from William of Malmesbury.

[2] Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, *s. a.*

[3] Freeman ii. 80.—"We can hardly fail to see in these appointments an attempt of Godwin and the patriotic party to counterbalance the merely French tendencies of Edward himself."

[4] *Norman Conquest*, ii. 81.

[5] Freeman, ii. 67.

against this foreign influence in the Church of the land, is heard of again in a singular manner about the time of Edward's coronation. Stigand, appointed priest at Assandun by Cnut, had been nominated to a bishopric, but his nomination had been cancelled before consecration. Now again he is both nominated and consecrated bishop of Elmham in East Anglia.[1] But he is not allowed to enjoy his dignity. He is deprived of his See, and his goods are confiscated, probably on the ground that he was aiding and abetting Queen Emma in her schemes for bringing in a Danish prince.[2] In the year 1047, however, Stigand regained a sufficient influence to obtain the appointment to the important See of Winchester, vacant by the death of Bishop Ælfsige.

4. Lyfing, bishop of Worcester, died in 1046, and was succeeded in that See by Ealdred, whose name frequently occurs in the after history. In the Devonshire bishopric Lyfing was succeeded by Leofric, a Briton, that is, probably, a native of Cornwall and a Briton by race.[3] The episcopate of this prelate was signalised by the removal of the See from Crediton to Exeter (1050), and in the church of St. Peter in that city, Leofric was solemnly enthroned by Edward and Emma. This, and the removal of the See of St. Cuthbert to Durham, was the beginning of that policy which was consummated by the Council of London in 1075. Bishop Leofric was an upholder of the secular cause as against the monastic. He removed the nuns from the Church of Exeter, and substituted for them a society of secular canons, who were to live according to the rule of Chrodegand,[4] though not bound by monastic vows, nor wearing the monastic habit.

[1] The See of Dunwich had been amalgamated with Elmham, which now included Norfolk and Suffolk. It was soon after moved to Thetford, and then to Norwich. [2] Freeman, ii. 65. [3] *Ib.*, ii. 83.

[4] The rule of Chrodegang followed closely that of St. Benedict for monks. The same canonical hours are enjoined. The bishop stands in the place of the Abbot, the Archdeacon of the Prior. But there are two fundamental differences. The canons were bound neither by the vow of poverty, nor, in its monastic strictness, by the vow of implicit obedience. See Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, Article "Chrodegang."

5. While the national and foreign parties in the Church of England were more or less evenly balanced in the appointment of prelates, the latter party gained great strength by the custom which began to prevail about the middle of the century, of English prelates attending at foreign Councils. At the Synod of Rheims, held by Pope Leo (1049), several English prelates were present, and at that of Vercellæ (1050), held to condemn the doctrines of Berengarius, English affairs took a prominent place. The previous year Eadnothus II., bishop of Dorchester, who had built a fair church at Stow in Lindsey, to do honour to the old home of his See,[1] had died, and the great See of Dorchester was conferred by the king on one of his Norman chaplains, named Ulf. One of the old English chroniclers says emphatically, "he ill bestowed it;" another declares of Ulf, "he did nothing bishop-like, so that it shames us now to tell more."[2] This objectionable prelate had now to appear before the Council to seek confirmation from the Pope—an innovation rapidly growing at this time. He was found very incompetent. The Chronicle says: "They were very near breaking his staff, if he had not given the greater treasures, because he could not do his offices as well as he should."[3] The "greater treasures," however, availed to procure for Ulf confirmation and consecration, and he returned from Vercellæ bishop of Dorchester, a standing monument of the lengths to which the king's evil partiality for foreigners could carry him.

6. But a still more striking and insulting proof of this was now to be given to the Church of England. Before the end of the year (1050) Archbishop Eadsige died. He had previously been incapacitated by illness, and had consecrated Siward as his coadjutor. But Siward died before him, and after his death Eadsige had performed, or attempted to perform, his archiepiscopal functions again. The monks of Christ Church elected as his successor Ælfric, a monk of their house, and a kinsman of Earl Godwin.

[1] Stow, no doubt, was the ancient Siddena or Sidnacester, the original home of the Lindsey bishopric.

[2] A.-S. Chron. (ed. Thorpe), ii. 140-142. [3] *Ib.*, p. 143.

The king disregarded their choice, and bestowed the primacy on Robert, the Norman bishop of London. He was probably the most unpopular foreign prelate in the kingdom, and as his influence with the king was known to be all-powerful, the worst was feared from the appointment.[1] Robert at once went to Rome, and returned with the pall. On St. Peter's day (June 29, 1051), he was enthroned. His first act was a remarkable assertion of papal authority as against national law and custom. Spearhafoc, abbot of Abingdon, had been nominated bishop of London, and applied to the new Primate for consecration. Robert refused to consecrate him. He declared that he had been forbidden to do so by the Pope.[2] The abbot, though denied consecration, nevertheless went to occupy his See; "he resided in it with the king's full leave all the summer and autumn."[3] But the foreign influence was for the moment all-powerful. Spearhafoc was expelled, and William, a Norman, consecrated in his room. Earl Godwin, the head of the English party, was banished, and Norman influence seemed to be triumphant both in Church and State.

7. The return of Earl Godwin and Harold, in the following year, by force of arms, changed the whole aspect of affairs. The foreign prelates, dreading the popular indignation, were then only anxious to fly. Of the two most conspicuous among them the chronicler tells us: "Archbishop Robert, with Bishop Ulf and their companions, went out at East-gate (London), and slew and otherwise maltreated many young men, and straightway betook themselves to Eadulfsness (Walton-on-the-Naze), and there lighted on a crazy ship, and he betook him-

[1] Robert, in order to strengthen the Norman influence in England, began the practice of establishing *alien* priories—little establishments of foreign monks, being branches or offshoots of great foreign houses. These served admirably to uphold foreign influence, but they were a terrible thorn in the side of the English bishops, to whose discipline they would not submit. See Hook's *Archbishops*, i. 496.

[2] "Things had come to such a pass, that an Englishman appointed to an English office by the king and his Witan was to be kept out of its full possession by one foreigner acting at the alleged bidding of another."—Freeman, ii. 122.

[3] A.-S. Chron., ii. 144.

self at once over the sea, and left his pall and all Christianity here in the country, so as God willed it, as he had before obtained the dignity as God willed it not." [1] The next day the Witan proclaimed the fugitive bishops to be outlaws. The bishop of London is said by one chronicler to have escaped with Robert and Ulf, but the chronicler quoted above does not mention him. As he was soon afterwards restored to his See, it is probable that he did not share in their flight, or at least not in the violent deeds which seem to have accompanied it.[2] The Primate at once betook himself to the Pope. There had been few (if any) appeals by English Churchmen from a sentence of an English Court to the Roman Curia since the time of Wilfrid.[3] Wilfrid, indeed, had not gained much by his action, neither did Archbishop Robert. No notice, in fact, was taken of his appeal in England, and by the consent of the Witan,[4] Stigand, bishop of Winchester, was advanced to the primacy, and took possession of the pall which Robert had left behind him.

8. It is somewhat remarkable that Stigand should have been chosen for the primacy rather than Ælfric, who had been elected by the Canterbury monks before Robert's intrusion. But Stigand had been engaged in negotiating between the king and Earl Godwin. He was a person evidently of much influence and energy of character. The popular party probably desired him, and the king, who was for the moment helpless, as being deserted by his foreign allies, yielded. The policy, however, of at once advancing Stigand, was an unfortunate one. He continued to hold the See of Winchester, and thus gave sufficient ground for his enemies to declare his promotion uncanonical. He had never been elected by the chapter of his See, which was also opposed to precedent. He did not affect to disregard the Roman pall, but seized upon that of Robert, which was an absurd pretence. At length he applied for a pall for himself, but to a usurping Pope.

[1] A.-S. Chron., ii. 152.

[2] See Freeman, ii. 331, note 1.

[3] Hook's *Archbishops*, i. 504.

[4] This seems to be implied by the chronicler, but is not absolutely stated.

Churchmen generally in the country regarded him not as legitimate Primate, but simply as *de facto* archbishop. The consecrations of prelates during his incumbency were generally done by other hands.[1] Harold himself passed him over, and preferred the ministry of other prelates. Finally, Duke William was able to allege as one of the reasons which called him to England, the uncanonical intrusion of Stigand into the primacy of the church.[2] As regards the other bishops who were implicated in these troubles, Ulf of Dorchester was after a time replaced by Wulfwig, an Englishman, and William was restored to the See of London. He was now the only Norman who retained a bishopric.[3]

9. After the death of Godwin, his son, the Earl Harold, occupied the position of greatest influence in the land, and was able, for the most part, to bend the king to his will. The contest between seculars and regulars, begun in the days of Dunstan, still continued. The Devonshire See had been provided with a secular chapter. It was now attempted to do the same for the See of Wiltshire, and Harold's influence was invoked and exercised to save the threatened monks. Hermann, a man of Flanders, was bishop of Ramsbury. He complained to the king that he neither had a chapter of clerks nor a sufficient revenue, and he asked that both might be supplied to him by the gift of the abbey of Malmesbury, the abbot of which was lately dead. The monks might be made to give way to canons. The revenues of the monastery would supply what was lacking in the See. The king agreed to the proposal. The Malmesbury monks, animated by the usual hatred of monks towards bishops, addressed themselves to Harold. He obtained for them a reversal of the grant of the monastery, and the baffled bishop retired abroad in anger.[4]

[1] Yet it is remarkable that *after* the Conquest and by consent of William, Remigius was consecrated by Stigand.

[2] See Freeman, ii. 342, and Appendix U. William of Malmesbury has much to say of the matter, both in the *De Gestis Regum* and *De Gestis Pontificum*. In the latter he attributes Stigand's errors to ignorance.

[3] Freeman, ii. 346.

[4] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pontif.*, 142 (ed. Saville). Mr.

10. Earl Harold appears as the champion of the monks on this occasion. But it is by no means to be inferred from this that he was a partisan of the cause of the regulars as against the seculars. The noble college which he built and endowed at Waltham, and in which he established secular clergy, rather proves the contrary. Waltham was connected with the legend of a famous crucifix, and a small church had been built there by Tofig before it passed into the hands of Harold. This was rebuilt by the earl on a splendid scale, and enriched with precious gifts. A dean and twelve canons, liberally endowed, were settled in this church. These clergy were not bound by vows. Some of them were probably married. Their duty was not merely to minister in the church, but to form a school. A man famous for learning, Adelard of Lüttich, was brought over to be lecturer in the college. The foundation of Waltham, so plainly differenced from the monasteries by its evident usefulness, stands out unique in its day, and was an anticipation by some centuries of the great colleges of our universities.[1] The church of the college was consecrated in May 1060, and it is remarkable that Archbishop Stigand was not called to perform the duty, but Cynesige, Archbishop of York. It has been argued from this that Harold was in doubt as to the canonical status of Stigand, but it scarcely seems probable that such scruples should have occurred to him. Stigand, if not canonically Archbishop of Canterbury, was at any rate canonically a bishop, and therefore competent to perform this office. But it may be that the feelings of the clergy present were against him.

11. Soon after the consecration of Waltham, we find Earl Harold involved in a dispute with Gisa, the Lotharingian bishop of Wells. He is said to have kept back

Freeman puts the occurrence in 1055. Hermann afterwards returned and became bishop of Sherborne, as well as Ramsbury, and twelve years after the Conquest, transferred the united Sees to Salisbury.—Freeman, ii. 406.

[1] The interesting subject of Waltham has been so fully worked out by our great Oxford historians, Messrs. Stubbs and Freeman, that nothing remains to be elucidated. See the Treatise *De Inventione* and Mr. Stubbs's Preface, and Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, ii. 439, *sq.*

from the bishop some estates belonging to the See. It was not on any ecclesiastical grounds that the quarrel turned, and we do not find that Harold, on this occasion, was acting as the champion of the regulars, as he had done at Malmesbury. Gisa, indeed, was busy, not in expelling monks, but in enlarging, strengthening, and enriching the very feeble canonical body which he had found in existence on his promotion to the See.

12. Archbishop Cynesige, the consecrator of Waltham, died before the close of the year, and his place was immediately filled by Ealdred, bishop of Worcester, who attempted once more to carry out the arrangement, for which there was a considerable amount of evil precedent, of holding Worcester in conjunction with York. Of this prelate, William of Malmesbury has some strange stories to relate. First of all, he declares that it was by the administration of a bribe that Ealdred "abused the simplicity of Edward," and obtained the grant of the northern archbishopric. Then he has a very interesting account of Ealdred's journey to Rome to fetch the pall. He went in company with Gisa and Walter, who sought consecration, and also in company with Earl Tostig and his suite, who were bound to the Papal See on business of the king's. Ealdred was kindly received by Pope Nicholas, and made to sit by his side in a synod which Nicholas had summoned against the simoniacs. The two bishops-elect were examined and consecrated, but the scrutiny in Bishop Ealdred's case did not turn out so favourably. He was compelled to admit that he had paid money for his promotion, and the avowal being, as it seems, openly made, it was necessary to inflict an open censure. He was sentenced to be degraded from all ecclesiastical dignity. After this, the English party, much humiliated and very indignant, set out on their homeward journey. But at Sutrium a band of robbers fell upon them, and stripped them of all their goods. This, as it happened, was a fortunate occurrence for Ealdred. They returned to the Pope, and Earl Tostig, full of fury, proceeded to hurl reproaches at him for what had occurred. "Of what value," he asked, "were his excommunications when there were at his very doors

those who utterly despised them?" The Pope was severe to suppliants, but had no weapon to launch against open rebels. He claimed the restitution of what they had been robbed of through the Pope's ill government. If they were not compensated, the English king would be justified in stopping the payment of the tribute of St. Peter. The Pope, terrified at this threat, at once changed his demeanour. He conferred the pall upon Ealdred for York, only stipulating that he should resign the Worcester See.[1]

13. The Archbishop Ealdred returned with the pall (1061), and was soon followed by certain papal Legates, partly, no doubt, with a view of seeing that his promise of the resignation of the See of Worcester was effectively carried out. There was, at that time, at the head of the Worcester monastery, a prior named Wulfstan, a man distinguished alike for learning and sanctity. He was the friend of Harold, and acceptable at the same time to the Witan and to the papal Legates. The monastic chapter readily elected him to the See, but Wulfstan himself was with difficulty persuaded to undertake the office. He was consecrated by his predecessor, Archbishop Ealdred,[2] and became the most valuable and saintly prelate of his era. Though of pure English race, and, through his friendship with Harold, committed to strong opposition to the foreign invaders, Wulfstan nevertheless secured by his conspicuous virtues the respect of the Conqueror, and was able to render to his Church and country the great service of suppressing to a considerable extent the iniquitous traffic with Ireland in slaves, which then prevailed at the port of Bristol.[3]

14. While the national and foreign influences were contending for mastery in the Church of England, the king was ever unmistakably on the side of the foreigners. Edward desired to bring the Church of the land into more

[1] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pontif.*, p. 154 (ed. Saville). *Vita St. Wulfstani.—Ang. Sacra*, ii. 250.

[2] William of Malmesbury says Ealdred robbed him of almost all his farms; and it was not till after his death that Wulfstan succeeded in obtaining their restoration.

[3] See Life of St. Wulfstan by William of Malmesbury in *Anglia Sacra*, vol. ii. The slave-trade is described at page 258.

and more complete subjection to the Church of Rome. One cause of this was the intense and special devotion which he ever felt and expressed to the *cultus* of St. Peter. In honour of this saint, the adopted patron of his life, the king had been engaged in erecting a costly and noble monument. On the island of Thorney, famous for its connection with the earliest Christianity in the land, Edward had enlarged and rebuilt the ancient monastery, and had long been occupied in raising a grand abbey church destined to eclipse all other religious buildings in the land. This was to celebrate for ever the glories of St. Peter. Foreign workmen and the architectural skill then being wonderfully developed on the Continent, had enabled him to erect a magnificent temple, and on the 28th December[1] 1065 the church of the West Minster was consecrated with every circumstance of pomp, the whole of the notables of England, both in Church and State, being present.[2] There was one conspicuous personage, however, who was absent from the grand ceremonial, and this was King Edward himself. Overpowered by a malady which was fast bringing him to his grave, Edward was constrained to entrust the task of representing the founder of the church to his Queen, Edith. Within eight days of the consecration of the abbey, the funeral rites of its builder were celebrated within it, and very soon afterwards it was the scene of the consecration of the newly elected king, the Earl Harold.

15. At the time of the death of King Edward, Archbishop Stigand displayed great energy and vigour. He at once, as the first man in the country, summoned the Witan. The members of it were already present at Westminster for the ceremony of the consecration, and in fact, the regular winter Parliament was proceeding there. But

[1] The chronicler calls it "Childemas Day," the feast of the Holy Innocents.

[2] No part of the minster as built by Edward now remains, save a few bases of pillars and other fragments. But a considerable amount of the domestic buildings of the abbey is to be discovered. See Freeman, ii. 507. In a Norman-French poem called *The History of St. Edward the King*, published in the Rolls Series, there is a full account of the church and the consecration.

Stigand took the initiative in calling upon it to act in the matter of the succession. It was a difficult question. The nearest heir of the royal family was a boy, but in those days there was no absolute law of hereditary succession. The Witan chose Earl Harold, the brother of the Queen Dowager,—and confessedly the most worthy of the crown of any man in the kingdom. The people gladly accepted him. Then Stigand consecrated Harold in the new abbey of Westminster.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL LAWS OF EDWARD THE CONFESSOR.

1. Clergymen and scholars to enjoy privileges of their order, and to be under protection of the Church. 2. Times during which lawsuits and prosecutions were to cease — viz. from Advent to Octaves of Epiphany; from Septuagesima to Octaves of Easter; from Ascension-day to Octaves of Whitsunday; the three days in Ember weeks; Saturdays, from afternoon till Monday morning; vigils of the days of St. Mary, St. Michael, St. John Baptist, the Apostles, and other chief saints; anniversaries of consecration of churches; persons travelling for any religious act or purpose, were to be exempted from molestation. 3. Church business to have precedence in the king's courts. 4. Church tenants to plead in Church courts,[1] unless these fail in doing justice. 5. Church, churchyard, and priest's house and premises to be sanctuary, unless sanctuary be abused for purposes of crime. Restitution of stolen goods to be compelled in the case of thieves taking sanctuary. 6. Any person injuring church or clergy to be cited if contumacious to the king's courts. If he refused to appear, to be outlawed, and his head might lawfully be taken. 7. The tenth sheaf of corn, the tenth of cattle, cheese, and milk to be paid to the Church. 8. Tenth of fees, underwood, meadow, parks, warrens, fish-ponds, mills, gardens, and gains in trading, to go to the Church. "This revenue granted by the king, the nobility, and the commons." 9. Regulations for the trial by ordeal. 10 and 11. Regulate payments for Peter's pence and Danegelt. 12. Fixes the amount of fine for killing a slave or tenant. The king and archbishop to receive three marks each, bishop and ealdorman twenty shillings each. 13. Regulates treasure-trove in churchyards. Gold to go to the king, of silver the Crown to have half, the Church the other. All Jews in the kingdom are declared to be under the protection and guardianship of the Crown.

[1] *i.e.* Courts presided over by Church officials, manor courts of the Church—not spiritual courts.

CHAPTER XI.

FOREIGN INFLUENCE TRIUMPHANT IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

1066-1087.

1. Ecclesiastical effects of the Conquest. 2. Appointment of foreign prelates. 3. Ravages of the Normans. 4. Council of Winchester, 1070. 5. Council and Synod of Windsor, 1070. 6. Appointment of Lanfranc to the primacy. 7. Consecration of Thomas, Archbishop of York. 8. Lanfranc visits Rome. 9. Primacy dispute settled at Winchester and Windsor, 1072. 10. Building of cathedral churches by the foreign prelates. 11. Change of Sees from villages to cities. 12. Prohibition of clerical matrimony. 13. Separation between ecclesiastical and lay jurisdictions. 14. Effects of this. 15. The royal supremacy under William. 16. Independent spirit towards Rome shown by Lanfranc. 17. The attempt to secularise the monastic cathedrals. 18. St. Wulfstan at Worcester. 19. St. Osmund at Salisbury. 20. Remigius at Lincoln. 21. Hardships of English monks.

1. THE contest which had been proceeding through all the reign of Edward between foreign and natural influences in the Church of England, was destined to be completely decided in favour of the former by the great secular revolution of the Conquest. It was as much the policy of the Conqueror to substitute foreign ecclesiastics for native in places of influence in the Church, as it was for him to put foreigners into places of power, wealth, and influence in the State.[1] And thus it came about that, putting aside instances of individual hardship and oppression, the Church of England generally suffered this mischief at the Conquest —it lost to a great extent its nationality. And the Church policy of the Conqueror contributed towards the same end as his administration of preferment. The separation of the

[1] Throughout this chapter I am constantly indebted to Mr. Freeman's chapter on The Ecclesiastical Settlement of England at the Conquest (ch. xix. vol. iv.)

ecclesiastical from the secular, both in legislation and jurisdiction, snapped asunder some of the national bands, and threw the Church of England more directly into the arms of the Pope. But while the Church in England suffered in the point of its nationality, it gained considerably in the matter of its efficiency.[1] A vast amount of vigour was imported into the Church as into the State, though in both cases accompanied by injustice and cruel wrongs.

2. The first ecclesiastical effect of the Conquest was shown in the exclusion of bishops and abbots of the English race from all preferment. The deposition of those already in possession was soon to follow, but at first a cautious moderation was observed. Stigand and his friends must have anticipated the coming storm, but it did not come immediately. William, indeed, would not accept his "hallowing" from the hands of Stigand, but preferred Ealdred, Archbishop of York, who "hallowed him on Midwinter's day at Westminster."[2] Stigand, however, was allowed to perform other episcopal acts, and was not immediately suspended.[3] But though some of his acts were tolerated, the Primate was not trusted, and when William visited Normandy in 1067, Stigand was taken with him as a sort of hostage, perhaps to ensure the quiet of the national party in the English Church. Athelnoth, abbot of Glastonbury, was also made to accompany William, probably for the same reason. Some time during the year 1067, probably near to its close, the Primate was permitted or obliged to consecrate Remigius to the See of Dorchester.[4] Remigius was a monk of Fescamp, who had been long employed by William, and who is said by all the chroniclers to have

[1] "The English Church was drawn into the general tide of ecclesiastical politics, and lost much of its insular character; it gained in symmetry and definiteness of action, and was started on a new career." —Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 280. [2] A.-S. Chron., ed. Thorpe, ii. 169.

[3] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pontif.*, p. 36 (ed. Hamilton).

[4] See the *Professio Remigii* made to Lanfranc, printed in Girald. Camb. vii. (Appendix A). The editor does not appear to be aware that this Profession had been before printed by Dr. Inett in an English translation. Remigius was, no doubt, consecrated in 1067, but at what period of the year is uncertain. Mr. Freeman puts it quite at the end (iv. 131).

made a direct compact with his patron, that on the condition of furnishing him with a ship and armed men, he should succeed to the first See which fell vacant in England.[1] Wulfwig, bishop of Dorchester, died soon after the Conquest, and the great Mercian See was given to Remigius. It may have been from a refinement of malice that the English Primate was thus made to inaugurate the ascendency of the foreigner, and to perform an act which certainly presaged his own downfall. Certain it is that this appointment was the beginning of a complete era of exclusion for English-born Churchmen from all preferment. "For a long time the appointment of an Englishman to a bishopric is unknown, and even to a great abbey it is extremely rare."[2]

3. For the two years which succeeded the Conquest there may be said to have been no Church history in England. The whole land was writhing in the deadly grasp of the Conqueror. First in the west and south, and then in the north, a devastation of the country, conducted in a systematic and ruthless fashion, which the inhumanity of no previous tyrant had conceived, and which left the ravages of the Danes far behind, paralysed all action save the mere struggle for life. The minster of York was now burned,[3] as that of Canterbury had been (accidentally) on the day of William's return from Normandy. William professed a reverence for the Church and its sanctuaries, and some of the richer English, hoping by this means to shield somewhat of their property, had stored up wealth in the monasteries. The only effect of this was to cause William to make a general raid on the monasteries. Throughout the whole of England, says a chronicler, he caused the monasteries to be carefully searched, and all deposits found in them to be carried away into his treasury. Another chronicler declares that he not only stole money but charters which he had himself ratified; and another, that he did not spare the sacred chalices and shrines of the saints.[4] This spoliation took place during the Lent of

[1] Will. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pont.*, p. 312 (ed. Hamilton).

[2] Freeman, iv. 131.

[3] Flor. Wig., ii. 4 (E. H. S.)

[4] Flor. Wigorn., ii. 5; A.-S. Chron., ii. 176; Thorn., p. 1787 (ed. Twysden); Matt. Paris, ii. 6 (ed. Luard).

1070, and William thus inaugurated the ecclesiastical settlement of the land with which he now proceeded to occupy himself.

4. At Winchester after Easter 1070 met the great council of the nation. William was again crowned, but this time not by an English bishop, but by the Legates of the Pope sent to congratulate him, and to assist him in the great work of bringing the English Church more completely under a foreign yoke, and of deposing the national bishops. The Primate Stigand was the first to suffer. There was abundance of colourable pretext for his deposition. He had held the bishopric of Winchester together with the primacy; he had thrust himself into the primacy while Robert was yet alive; he had used his pallium, and (worst of all) he had applied to Benedict the anti-pope for a pallium for himself. In his case the malice of the Pope against one who had supported a rival, as well as the hatred of William to a man of English race, might both be gratified, and Stigand was deposed, and imprisoned for the remainder of his life at Winchester.[1] The next victim was Æthelmær the brother of Stigand, who had succeeded him as bishop of the East Angles, and whom, doubtless, his close relationship to the Primate was held sufficient to condemn.[2] Florence of Worcester adds, "Certain abbots were there degraded, the king endeavouring that as many as possible of the English should be deprived of their honour, in whose place he substituted persons of his own race for the confirmation of the new kingdom which he had acquired.[3] And some, both bishops and abbots, against whom there was no apparent cause of condemnation, either from the councils or the secular laws, he deprived of their honours, and detained

[1] Flor. Wig., ii. 5. Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pontif.*, 37. This last writer accuses Stigand of simony and grievous covetousness.

[2] Mr. Freeman notes, from the Domesday Survey, that Æthelmær had a wife (iv. 335, and note).

[3] Eadmer says, "Usus atque leges quas patres sui et ipse in Normanniâ habere solebant in Angliâ servare volens de hujusmodi personis episcopos abbates et alios principes per totam terram instituit, de quibus indignum judicaretur si per omnia suis legibus, postpositâ omni aliâ consideratione, non obedirent."—*Hist. Nov.* (ed. Selden), i. 6.

as prisoners to the end of their lives, only, as I have said, induced to do this from a possible danger that might arise to the new kingdom."[1] This council also decreed the seizure of Æthelric, late bishop of Durham, who had retired from his See to the Peterborough monastery, and also the outlawry of Æthelwine, his successor in that bishopric.[2] The council dealt too with a man of more conspicuous position than some of these—one whose sanctity was recognised and venerated on all sides—Wulfstan, bishop of Worcester. There was no question of deposing this prelate, Englishman though he was. Such a proceeding would have been somewhat too monstrous. But Wulfstan himself came forward to demand the restitution to his See of lands, which had been, as he alleged, improperly taken from it by Ealdred, Archbishop of York. The matter was left undecided, on the ground that, the Church of York being vacant, there was no one to defend the opposite interest.[3]

5. At the national council held soon after (May 23) at Windsor, William nominated Thomas, a canon of Bayeux, to the archiepiscopal See of York, and Walkeline, one of his chaplains, to that of Winchester, vacant by the deposition of Stigand. The work of deposing the English prelates was then resumed, but now in a purely ecclesiastical Synod held by Ermenfrid, the Pope's Legate[4] (May 24). At this Synod Agelric (or Æthelric), the bishop of Selsey, was deposed. His offence is not specified, indeed the chronicler asserts that he was "free from fault," and that his deposition was "uncanonical." He was put in prison at Marlborough. Æthelric's crime was no doubt his nationality. Certain abbots were also now deposed. Herfast and Stigand, both Normans, were appointed bishops, the one of Elmham and the other of Selsey, and certain Norman monks received abbeys. The two primatial Sees

[1] Flor. Wig., ii. 5.

[2] Simeon of Durham records the fact of Æthelwine's attempted flight with a great amount of the treasures of the Church—his being driven back—his capture and confinement at Abingdon.—Sim. Dunelm., p. 41 (ed. Twysden).

[3] Flor. Wig., ii. 6.

[4] The chronicler is careful to tell us that it was by the "King's order" that the Legate acted.

being both vacant, the new bishop of Winchester was consecrated by Ermenfrid, the Pope's Legate.[1] Thus the subjugation of the English Church to the foreign authority went rapidly forward.

6. But in order to perfect and give stability to this policy, it was needful that an able and efficient man should be placed in the highest post of the Church, and then, by causing the new Metropolitan of York to make profession of canonical obedience to the new Primate of Canterbury, a unity and consistency might be given to the Church of England, and the scheme of St. Gregory for dividing it into two independent provinces might be altogether effaced. The choice of the king, which was ratified by the National Council, fell upon Lanfranc, abbot of Caen in Normandy. Lanfranc had been long well known to William. He was a native of Pavia in Italy, distinguished for his learning and acquirements no less than for his natural ability. In search of a monastery in which to make his profession, he had been attracted to Bec by finding the abbot with his frock tucked up employed in baking. He entered the monastery, and soon, by his lectures on dialectic, made the abbey famous. Having offended one of the royal chaplains[2] by deriding his ignorance, Lanfranc was summoned to court, and William quickly discerned his powers. He was promoted to be abbot of Caen, and then to be Primate of England. His selection for this great dignity was made known to him by the Legates of the Pope, Ermenfrid and Hubert, who went expressly to inform him of it, and a Synod was held in Normandy authorising him to accept the dignity. Lanfranc expressed his unwillingness, dwelling on the feebleness of his bodily powers, and his ignorance of the language of the country, and of the barbarous races over which he would have to preside. But these excuses, if genuine, were not allowed to have weight. Both William and the Pope evidently attached the greatest importance to securing this able man for the primacy. Lanfranc accordingly reached England in August, and having been duly elected by the chapter of Canterbury, he was consecrated there

[1] Flor. Wigorn., ii. 6 (E. H. S.)

[2] Herfast, afterwards made bishop of Elmham.

August 29, 1070) by William, bishop of London, Walkeline of Winchester, Remigius of Dorchester or Lincoln, Siward of Rochester, Herfast of Elmham, Hermann of Sherborne, Gisa of Wells.[1]

7. Soon after the consecration of the new Primate, Thomas, elect of York, arrived at Canterbury for consecration. Lanfranc, no doubt fully informed of the mind of the Pope in the matter, demanded of him a written profession of obedience to the See of Canterbury. Thomas replied that he would not do this unless he saw ancient authorities for it, and heard arguments to convince him that he could do it without prejudice to his church. Lanfranc, in his account of the matter, attributes this to ignorance on the part of Thomas, and to inexperience of the customs of England. But Thomas was no doubt well aware of the arrangement of St. Gregory, and also that it could not be shown from English custom that the northern Primate had always professed obedience to the southern. Thomas therefore went away unconsecrated. The king now thought it necessary to interpose. He held that Lanfranc was asking too much. Thomas also was a man well learned and of great knowledge. But Lanfranc was able to convince William that he had right and authority on his side, and Thomas was required to give a written profession of obedience. A sort of compromise was, however, allowed. No Archbishop of York was to be obliged to promise obedience to the See of Canterbury in future, unless a competent council should in the meantime decide that it was to be so. On these conditions Thomas was consecrated.[2]

8. Lanfranc, after his consecration, was required, as a dutiful son of the Papal See, to go to Rome for the pallium of Metropolitan. He took with him Thomas, the newly consecrated Archbishop of York, and Remigius, bishop of Dorchester and Lincoln. Both of these needed the papal dispensing power. Thomas was the son of a priest, and hence was considered to have canonical unfit-

[1] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pont.*, pp. 37, *sq.* (ed. Hamilton); Flor. Wig., ii. 7; *Lanfranci Epistolæ* (ed. Giles), i. 19, 20.

[2] Willelm. Malmesb. (*ex. Ep. Lanfranci*), p. 39. Freeman, iv. 350, *sq.*

ness for the ministerial office. Remigius had notoriously aided William by providing a ship and men-at-arms, on the understanding that he was to have a bishopric. He thus might be regarded as tainted with simony. Lanfranc was received with all honour by Pope Alexander. To the astonishment of all in the Roman Court, the Pope rose up as he entered; and, anticipating his prostration with an affectionate embrace, said, "We honour you not on account of your archbishopric, but as our old master, to whom we owe all we know—nevertheless, St. Peter must have his due reverence." Then Lanfranc prostrated himself before him, but was at once raised up and kissed, and made to sit by his side. The day was passed in pleasant discourse. On the morrow Lanfranc formally accused Thomas of being the son of a priest, and Remigius of having bought his See. The two prelates resigned their staves and rings, and prayed for a merciful consideration. Lanfranc declared them to be men of worth, and most useful to the king, and supported their prayer. Upon this the Pope said, "Look you, you are the father of that country; do you decide what is best to be done. Here are the pastoral staves, take them and use them as you hold best." Then Lanfranc, taking the staves, restored them to the two bishops.[1] He himself was gratified by the present not only of the ordinary pallium of Metropolitan, but also of another which the Pope himself was wont to use in saying mass. Then Thomas brought the question of the relative rights of Canterbury and York before the Pope. He claimed an independent primacy for York, and as suffragans of the See the bishops of Dorchester and Lincoln, Worcester and Lichfield. He quoted the letter of St. Gregory, which declared the two Sees equal, the priority of the prelates to be determined by date of consecration, and he asserted that the three bishops named had always been subject to his predecessors.[2] Lanfranc replied that the constitution of St. Gregory did not apply

[1] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, pp. 6, 7 (ed. Selden); Willelm. Malmesb., p. 65.

[2] This was altogether a mistake, but there had been sufficient complications in the history of the Mercian bishopries to make the contention plausible.

to Canterbury, but to London and York.[1] He also denied the assertion as to the three Mercian Sees. The Pope very wisely ordered the whole question to be examined and decided in England.[2]

9. Accordingly, at the Easter following (1072), the cause was discussed at Winchester, and the prelates brought forth their pleadings. Lanfranc caused the History of Bede to be read, showing how Canterbury was originally the Primatial See, and then quoted a long series of papal letters, all confirming and strengthening this position of Canterbury. The Archbishop of York contended that Gregory had given precedence merely to Augustine personally, that he had never assigned any primacy to the *See* of Canterbury, but had desired the southern primacy to be at London. To this Lanfranc replied that, in giving the primacy to Augustine, Gregory gave it also to his successors, even as Christ, in giving the primacy to Peter, gave it to his successors. This sophistical argument appears to have had some weight attached to it. "Thomas," says the chronicler, "succumbed to such great reasons." The primacy of Canterbury was decreed, and the Humber was to be the division of the two jurisdictions. The matter was finally decided in this sense at a council held at Windsor at Whitsuntide (1072),[3] which appears to have been a purely ecclesiastical assembly, sitting probably concurrently with

[1] St. Gregory had given Canterbury the primacy during the life of Augustine. Afterwards he decreed that York and London were to be the two primatial Sees, each with twelve suffragans, seniority giving the precedence. The arrangement never having been carried out, did not now apply.

[2] Willelm. Malmesb. (*Ex. Ep. Lanfranci*), pp. 41-65.

[3] For the full account see Lanfranc's letter to the Pope, quoted in Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pontif.*, 41-65 (ed. Hamilton); and the same writer, *De Gest. Reg.*, p. 66 (ed. Saville). Mr. Freeman says that the council at Winchester was purely ecclesiastical; that at Windsor the general Gemot, and therefore partly lay (iv. 358 and notes). I venture with much diffidence to differ from this view. Lanfranc (*Ep.* 23) speaks of the Winchester Council as having the lay element. William of Malmesbury says of the Windsor Council that it was composed of "the king, the bishops, and abbots of divers orders." The matter would therefore appear to have been terminated by the spirituality alone.

the Gemot. At the same council the important matter of the precedence of the bishops in council was settled—Canterbury was to preside, York was to sit at his right hand, next to him was to be Winchester, and on the left of Canterbury, London. If York, in the absence of Canterbury, presided, London was to be on his right, Winchester on his left. The rest of the bishops in the order of their consecration.[1]

10. With the settlement of this dispute, the Church of England may be regarded as having fairly entered on the new phase and condition of things brought about by the Conquest. The foreign prelates who had been introduced into English Sees brought to them, for the most part, an increase of vigour, energy, and power. Everywhere cathedral churches, conceived with a grandeur of design, and executed with a solidity and beauty of detail unknown before in England, began to arise. At Canterbury Lanfranc rebuilt in seven years, with splendid magnificence,[2] the Metropolitan church, which had been destroyed by fire just at the period of the Conquest. The church of York was rebuilt by Archbishop Thomas. St. Paul's was begun by Bishop Maurice on a scale of vast splendour. Walkeline at Winchester raised a grand minster, much of which still remains untouched. Gundulf rebuilt Rochester, Wulfstan Worcester; while at Lincoln, on a new site, and in a newly chosen place for the cathedral of his diocese, the Norman Remigius raised a splendid pile, which on its completion was held to be inferior to none in England.

11. The change of the place of his See from Dorchester to Lincoln[3] by Remigius, was probably the first of those transfers of Sees in this reign which marked the increase of vigour in the Church as much as the rebuilding of the cathedral churches did. In the reign of Edward a change of this sort had taken place in the removal of the western See to Exeter, and at an earlier period in that of Lindisfarne to Durham. But now this policy was generally

[1] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Reg.*, 67.

[2] "The building was enriched with every ornament known to the age."—Freeman.

[3] See Henric. Huntingdon, *Hist.*, p. 213 (ed. Saville).

adopted and sanctioned by the decree of a council. The charter granted to Remigius for his new foundation recites that it was by the advice and authority of Alexander the Pope that he had transferred his See from Dorchester to Lincoln; and, as Alexander died early in 1073, it is probable that the removal had taken place before that date.[1] A council was held at St. Paul's in 1075, when a canon was enacted as follows:—"According to the decrees of Pope Damasus and Leo, and the Councils of Sardica and Laodicea, it is granted by royal favour and the authority of the Synod to three bishops to remove from villages to cities—that is, Hermann from Sherborne to Salisbury, Stigand from Selsey to Chichester, and Peter from Lichfield to Chester."[2] Other changes of a similar character followed later in the reign. Elmham, the East Anglian See, was removed to Thetford in 1078, and afterwards in 1101 to Norwich. Wells in 1088 ceased for a time to be the cathedral of the Somersetshire bishopric, and Bath was adopted in its place.

12. At the Council held by Lanfranc at Winchester in 1076, a very important matter touching the clergy was treated. Clerical celibacy was now being earnestly pressed by the great Pope who governed at Rome, and in 1074 a Roman Council had absolutely prohibited the marriage of the clergy. Lanfranc was now to consider how far this law could be applied to the English Church, in which clerical matrimony had never ceased to be an ordinary practice. Accordingly, at Winchester, a canon was enacted, which draws a distinction between the capitular and the secular clergy. It prohibits matrimony absolutely

[1] Both Mr. Freeman and Mr. Stubbs, however, put it in 1085. But the fact of the transference not being mentioned in the Council of London, 1075, seems to imply that it had taken place. Remigius, also, signs the acts of that council as Episcopus Lincolniensis. There seems, therefore, to be some good ground for the earlier date. Mr. Dimock (Giraldus Cambrensis, vii. 19) adopts the date of 1072, on the ground that the transference was ordered in the Windsor Council of 1072, together with other Sees; but in the London Council, where the other Sees are again mentioned, Dorchester and Lincoln are not mentioned.

[2] Johnson, *Eng. Canons*, ii. 14.

to the former, to the latter it forbids it for the time to come, allowing, however, the priests already married to continue living with their wives.[1] This, as has been well observed, although doubtless a politic compromise, nevertheless "amounted to giving up the point as a matter of principle. For if, as Hildebrand taught, no saving grace could be bestowed by the ministrations of a married priest, a large part of the people of England were doomed to go without valid sacraments for years to come."[2] As a matter of fact, the canon was never strictly observed in England, though its enactment and the repeated attempts to prop it up in after councils involved a considerable amount of unhappy subterfuges, and no small scandal to the Church. Another canon of this Council forbade any marriage to take place without the priest's benediction, and another forbade all "supplantation of churches." This latter was intended to check an abuse beginning to be very prevalent, by which all churches which could not show an actual charter or written title to their estates were liable to be despoiled of them. As estates in earlier times had frequently been conveyed by word of mouth, or by giving a staff, and without any written document, this was a grievous hardship, and it was also productive of many dishonest practices on the part of the holders of the estates, the monks without scruple forging documents by which the attacks of their adversaries might be defeated.[3]

13. At what precise date the most important part of the ecclesiastical policy of this reign — the separation between the ecclesiastical and secular jurisdictions — was carried out, is uncertain, the charters not being dated. In the early English Church, as has abundantly appeared, there was no separation between ecclesiastical and secular causes, either as regards the persons who tried them or the places where they were heard.[4] This was altogether

[1] Johnson, *English Canons*, ii. 18.

[2] Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, iv. 425.

[3] Johnson, *English Canons*, ii. 19. Mr. Johnson adds—"This was the cause of so many false deeds and charters as are everywhere to be found in the repositories of the antiquarians."

[4] "The practice of separating ecclesiastical and temporal affairs had

opposed to the policy of Pope Gregory, who sought to make the clearest possible distinction between the two, and under his directions probably Lanfranc exerted his influence upon the king to induce him to effect this. It is certain that William had no intention of allowing spiritual causes to be altogether removed from the controlling power of the Crown, but he consented to order a separation between them and lay suits in the first instance. This was done by the promulgation of two charters—one addressed to "the liege men of Essex, Hertford, and Middlesex;" the other, "to the Earls, Sheriffs, and all other persons, whether French born or English, within the bishopric of Remigius." The substance of the charter is the same in both cases. It runs as follows:—"Know ye and all my liege men in England that I have determined that the episcopal laws, which up to my time have not been right, nor according to the precepts of the sacred canons in the kingdom of the English, should be mended by a common council, and by the advice of my archbishops, bishops, abbots, and all the principal men of my kingdom. Wherefore I command and charge you, by royal authority, that no bishop nor archdeacon do hereafter hold pleas in the Hundred, according to the laws episcopal, nor bring any cause before the secular jurisdiction which concerns the regimen of souls. But whoever is impleaded by the laws episcopal for any causes or crime, let him come to the place which the bishop shall choose or name for this purpose, and there make answer concerning his cause and crime, and not according to the Hundred, but according to the canons and the laws episcopal let him do right to God and his bishop. But if any one, being lifted up with pride, scorn or refuse to come to the bishop's court, let him be summoned three several times; and if by this means he be not brought to amend, let him be excommunicated, and, if need be, for the support of this, let the strength and justice of the king and sheriff be used; and he who upon summons refuses to come to the episcopal court shall make satisfaction for every summons according to the laws episcopal. This also

even been solemnly condemned by a formal decree of a national Gemot."—Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, iv. 392.

I absolutely forbid, that any sheriff, provost, minister of the king, or any other layman, do any ways concern himself with the laws which belong to the bishop, and let no layman bring another man to judgment without the sentence of the bishop; and let judgment be nowhere undergone but in the bishop's See, or in that place which the bishop shall appoint for that purpose." [1]

14. It is hardly probable that an ordinance of this importance, setting forth, as it did, a complete change in the constitution of the country, and involving the most serious issues, should have been delayed so late in William's reign as 1285.[2] It is probably to be placed much earlier than this. "The change," says Mr. Stubbs, "involved far more than appeared at first. The growth of the canon law in the succeeding century from a quantity of detached local or occasional rules to a great body of universal authoritative jurisprudence gave to the clergy generally a far more distinctive and definite civil status than they had ever possessed before, and drew into Church courts a mass of business with which the Church had previously had only an indirect connection. . . . The clergy found themselves in a position external, if they chose to regard it so, to the common law of the land; able to claim exemption from the temporal tribunals, and by appeals to Rome to paralyse the regular jurisdiction of the diocesans. Disorder followed disorder, and the anarchy of Stephen's reign, in which every secular abuse was paralleled or reflected in an ecclesiastical one, prepared the way for the Constitutions of Clarendon and the struggle that followed, with all its results, down to the Reformation itself." [3]

15. The great increase in power which the Church gained by the separation of the two jurisdictions was compensated for under William by his vigorous assertion of the royal supremacy inherent in the Crown of England, and used by him in its true and fitting character as a check to the encroachments of the Pope. The right of investiture of spiritual persons in the privileges of their office was

[1] Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 81.

[2] This is the date conjectured by Sir H. Spelman, and accepted by Johnson.

[3] Stubbs, *Constit. Hist.*, i. 284.

always practised by William without question from the Pope. When Gregory demanded homage of him for the realm of England, he simply refused it on the ground that his predecessors had never paid it to the Pope's predecessors.[1] His other relations with the Pope are described by the historian Eadmer as follows:—"He was not willing to suffer any one in all his dominions to receive any actual pontiff of the Roman city as the apostolical pontiff except by his orders, or to accept his letters unless they had first been shown to himself. The Primate of his kingdom—I mean the Archbishop of Canterbury—when he presided at a general assembly of bishops, he did not allow to command or prohibit anything except such matters as were in accordance with his will, and had been first settled by himself. To none of his bishops did he give liberty to sue any of his barons or officers, if accused of incest or adultery, or any capital crime, or to pronounce excommunication upon them, or any ecclesiastical penalty, except by his orders."[2] The ecclesiastical supremacy, therefore, claimed and exercised by William I., even exceeded that which was exercised by Henry VIII., as this latter monarch never asserted a right to stay excommunications or purely Church censures.[3]

16. The same spirit of independence towards Rome exhibited by William was also in a measure shown by Archbishop Lanfranc. He was rebuked by Pope Gregory for not having brought the king to a better mind. He answered that he had indeed advised him differently, but had not persuaded him. The King's letters to the Pope, he says, have explained the reason. This was something like taking William's part as against the Pope. Accordingly Gregory's tone towards the English Primate becomes very severe. He is rebuked for not coming to Rome and presenting himself at the threshold of the Apostles, and is distinctly threatened with being suspended from his episcopal office if he does not appear within four months.

[1] *Epp. Lanfranci*, 10. Eadmer (ed. Selden), p. 164.

[2] Eadmer (ed. Selden), p. 6.

[3] "There was no time when the royal supremacy in matters ecclesiastical was more fully carried out than it was in the days of the Conqueror."—Freeman, iv. 437.

There is no record that Lanfranc obeyed this curt injunction, and certainly Gregory never proceeded to inflict suspension upon him.[1]

17. On one point of ecclesiastical policy Lanfranc was zealous to carry out the papal policy. In the history of the English Church before the Conquest, various attempts had been made to give effect to the views of Dunstan, by connecting all the cathedral churches with monasteries, and making the monks constitute the chapter; in which case the bishops as elected by the chapters would of course be regulars. This policy was only partially successful before the Conquest. More than half of the chapters continued to be composed of secular canons,[2] and the efforts that had been made to bring these canons under the rule of Chrodegand or Augustine had failed. It would seem that William was in favour of the arrangement of secular canons, as he allowed the new foundation of Remigius to be thus constituted. Indeed, Eadmer asserts that not only the bishops who were not regulars, but also the king and the chief men of the kingdom were of that opinion. They desired to get rid of the monks from Canterbury, and Walkeline, bishop of Winchester, had prepared a body of canons to supplant the monks at St. Swithun's.[3] But Lanfranc stood firm, and having obtained a letter from Pope Alexander strongly supporting him in his policy, he was able to frustrate the attempt to remove the monks from Canterbury,[4] to oblige Bishop Walkeline to give up his project for Winchester, and to

[1] See the letters of Gregory, printed in Labbe, *Concil.*, v. xii. One chief reason why Lanfranc was thus peremptorily summoned to Rome, was to meet Berengar of Tours, whose cause Gregory had taken up. The Pope publicly declared that Berengar was "much more diligent than Lanfranc in the study of the Scriptures." See Martene, vol. iv. 109.

[2] At the time of the Conquest, York, London, Hereford, Selsey, Wells, Exeter, Rochester, Lichfield, Dorchester, and Elmham, were secular—Winchester, Worcester, Sherborne, Durham, Canterbury, monastic.

[3] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.* (ed. Selden), p. 10.

[4] For the curious mixed history of the Chapter of Canterbury, see Mr. Stubbs's Preface to *Epp. Cantuar.*, pp. xxiii.-xxv.

enable Gundulf to substitute monks for canons at Rochester. The cathedrals thus continued to be divided nearly equally between the two systems.

18. The energy of the prelates of the period of the Conquest was not confined to church-building and external work. Zeal and earnestness may be observed in the work both of the bishops of the English race who were allowed to remain, and in the new-comers. The honour of the English bishops was well sustained by St. Wulfstan at Worcester, who has left behind him a name second to none of the prelates of that era.[1] The attempt to eject him from his See, on the ground of ignorance, altogether failed, for his life was so holy, and his character so high, that this for very shame could not be entertained.[2] The good English prelate was therefore allowed to continue his work. This work consisted not only in the rebuilding of his cathedral, and the vigorous government of his clergy,[3] but in an earnest attempt to get rid of the great scandal of his age and country by the abolition of the slave trade between England and Ireland. The account given by William of Malmesbury, in his Life of St. Wulfstan, of this unholy traffic almost surpasses belief. St. Wulfstan went to Bristol, then the head-quarters of the trade, and by his earnest and long-continued exhortations, induced the merchants in great measure to abandon it.[4]

19. The fame of St. Osmund, bishop of Salisbury, rests upon a somewhat different foundation from that of St. Wulfstan. He was pre-eminently a learned man, and skilled in all matters of ritual. William of Malmesbury says of him: "He brought together clerks from every quarter who were famous for letters, and by his liberal treatment of them, constrained them to remain with him. In his church more than anywhere else, was conspicuously seen

[1] "In sanctitate nostro sæculo nominatissimus." — Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pont.*, p. 278.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 285.

[3] "In divino segnitiem nullo modo patiens si quis ministrorum vel temulentiâ vel somnolentiâ victus matutinis non affuisset, acri ferulæ ictu in illum ulcisci."—*Ib.*, 282.

[4] See Life of St. Wulfstan in Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*, vol. ii.

an illustrious body of canons, renowned equally for their powers of song and for their literature. An abundance of books was sought for and got together, the bishop himself not disdaining either to copy or to bind them when written."[1] To the ritual zeal of Bishop Osmund the Church of England owed an amended Breviary and Missal, which, under the name of the Sarum Use, became the most generally adopted of the English Service Books.[2]

20. At Lincoln, Remigius, whose accession to his See had involved somewhat of scandal, redeemed his fame by his liberal and generous charity, and his active labours as a preacher. A writer of his life tells us that "every summer, from May till August, besides his ordinary works of charity, he gave support to a thousand poor persons, and besides this fed and clothed a hundred and sixty, who, being blind, lame, or sick, could not come to the general table. It was his wont to have with him at dinner every day thirteen poor persons, and every Saturday he was in the habit of celebrating a Maunday with the greatest humility. He founded a hospital for lepers at Lincoln, and for their support settled on it a rent of thirteen marks. These he frequently visited, comforted, and instructed. He found the flock committed to him steeped in horrible sins, accustomed to sell their own children into slavery, given to incest, adultery, and promiscuous fornication; these by his preaching and instruction, actively carried on in all parts of his diocese, he ceased not to strive to bring to a better mind."[3]

21. But the zeal and earnestness to be traced at the time of the Conquest were coincident with an impairing of the nationality of the Church and with unjust oppression towards some of its prelates. Still less scruple was shown as regards the abbeys than had been shown to the Sees.

[1] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pont.*, p. 184.

[2] Brompton, writing about 1200, says of Bishop Osmund's *Custom-book*, which contained the offices, that it was used almost everywhere in England, Wales, and Ireland.—Brompton, (ed. Twysden), 977. It was drawn up about 1085. Osmund is said to have been a relative of the Conqueror.

[3] Giraldus, *Vita Remigii*, *Op.*, vii. 17-20.

Everywhere abbots of English race were deposed, and foreigners substituted in their room. These also were great builders, and many magnificent structures rose under their hands.[1] But, for the monks of English race, their rule was doubtless severe and harsh. In one notorious instance, indeed, the tyranny of an abbot involved a wholesale massacre of the monks. At Glastonbury, Thurstan of Caen insisted on the monks giving up the use of the Gregorian chants, and adopting the use of William of Fescamp. They resisted, and the abbot, furious at their insubordination, called in armed soldiers and bade them shoot the refractory monks; three were slain and eighteen wounded.[2] At Malmesbury, Turold, intruded on the abbey on the expulsion of Brehtric, governed his monks with such strict military discipline that William transferred him to Peterborough, where he thought his military qualities might be more usefully employed in resisting Hereward and the English outlaws.[3] But more galling to the monks, perhaps, than even the strict discipline, was the contempt poured by the new-comers on the saints of the English race. In some cases their tombs were opened and their bones scattered.[4] The Primate set the example of undervaluing English saints. He refused to acknowledge the merits of St. Elphege, saying that he was slain for not paying a sum of money, and not for contending for the faith.[5] This error he afterwards, indeed, abandoned, on the persuasion of St. Anselm; but its origin indicates a contemptuous tone of mind towards the worthies of the English Church, which no doubt was the feeling prevalent among the Norman ecclesiastics.[6] Thus the English clergy and monks had to bear not only the spoiling of their goods, but also the mortification of being undervalued and despised by the dominant race. It was scarce possible, in-

[1] "Ubique nova monasteriorum ædificia, sicut hodie apparet, constructa."—Eadmer, p. 7.

[2] A.-S. Chronicle, ii. 185.

[3] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pontif.*, p. 420.

[4] Matt. Paris., *Gest. Abb. S. Albani.*

[5] Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, p. 42 (ed. Selden).

[6] Eadmer says:—"Angli isti inter quos degimus instituerunt sibi quosdam quos colerent Sanctos. De sanctitatis eorum merito animum a dubietate flectere nequeo."

deed, that it should be otherwise. But if these temporary inconveniences and troubles ushered in the beginnings of a higher life and greater earnestness in the Church, they certainly have some compensation, at least in the judgment of posterity.

CHAPTER XII.

CONTEST BETWEEN THE LAY AND SPIRITUAL POWERS.

1087-1107.

1. An organised system of simony. 2. Anselm comes to England. 3. Appointed Archbishop of Canterbury. 4. Negotiations with the King, and consecration. 5. Beginning of quarrel with William. 6. Ecclesiastical business at Hastings in 1094. 7. Council of Rockingham; Anselm outlawed. 8. The King obtains the pall from the Pope. 9. Anselm goes to Rome. 10. Consecration of the first Bishop of Waterford. 11. Confiscation of Church revenues. 12. Anselm returns to England. 13. Has to face the custom of lay investiture of prelates. 14. Progress of the dispute; counter-statements of the Envoys. 15. The Council of Westminster (1102). 16. The prelates-elect converted to Anselm's views. 17. Anselm again at Rome; Henry seizes the Canterbury estates. 18. Mischievous effects of Anselm's absence from his See. 19. Exactions from the clergy by the King. 20. Settlement of the investiture dispute. 21. Nature of the compromise.

1. On the death of William I. and the accession of his son the Church of England had to contend against a new class of enemies and a new sort of dangers. However harshly and unjustly William I. may have sometimes acted towards Churchmen, there is no reason to question the truth of his own assertion, made at his death, that he had never sold Church offices for money. It is true that the reward given to Remigius for substantial service, according to a previous compact, had much the same character; but, at any rate, a decent veil was thrown over simony; it was neither openly exhibited nor encouraged.[1] On the accession of William II. all this was changed. By a systematic and acknowledged arrangement introduced by a clerk named Ralph Flambard, who was appointed the king's Justiciary, all Church prefer-

[1] Ordericus Vitalis says of him—"The heresy of simony he utterly abhorred, and in choosing bishops and abbots he considered not so much men's riches or power as their holiness and wisdom."

ments were openly administered for the benefit of the royal revenue. Whenever a prelate or beneficed clerk died, the royal officers at once took seisin of the benefice, and received the profits for the Crown, until such time as a clerk could be found who would pay to the royal exchequer the price at which the preferment was valued. This system was not fully carried out during the lifetime of Lanfranc, of whom the king stood in some little awe; but at his death in 1089, not only the estates of the primatial See, but the whole of the ecclesiastical estates of England, were deliberately treated as the property of the Crown, to be granted out on a sort of feudal tenure to occupants who would pay a sufficient honorarium, or else to be held continuously for the use of the king. By this arrangement not only was the most grievous injustice and robbery continually perpetrated by the State, but the whole of the clergy of England were encouraged and almost compelled to taint themselves with simony.[1] A rapid deterioration of the character of the clergy and of the condition of the Church followed necessarily upon such a state of things as this. The open and scoffing profligacy and contempt for religion exhibited by the king and his minions contributed an evil influence, and Christianity seemed in danger of perishing out of the land, when one was raised up whose work had a mighty influence in staying the progress of evil and upholding truth and righteousness.

2. This man, whose influence was destined to be so valuable for the English Church, was Anselm, abbot of Bec. A native by birth of the subalpine town of Aosta, he had crossed the Alps and been attracted to the Norman abbey of Bec by the fame of Lanfranc's teaching. When Lanfranc was removed to Caen he succeeded him as prior, and in 1078 he became abbot of Bec, and in that same year paid a visit to England, where the Norman abbey had been endowed with divers estates. "With a larger heart than the Normans," says his biographer, "he warmed towards the English with something of the love and

[1] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Reg.*, p. 69 *b* (ed. Saville); Ordericus Vitalis, B. x. ch. 2. On the systematic character of the scheme of Ralph Flambard, see Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 298.

sympathy which had filled the soul of the great Roman Pope who had sent us St. Augustine."[1] Anselm's visits to England were repeated several times after this, and in 1092, when the church and lands of Canterbury had been for long years in the hands of the notorious Ralph Flambard, and men were weary and sick of the unrighteous practices and scandalous oppressions by which the Church was being degraded, Hugh, Earl of Chester, prevailed with much difficulty on the famous abbot to make another visit to the suffering land. The general feeling as to the iniquity of keeping the Church without an archbishop was so strong that, at the meeting of the Court at Gloucester at Christmas 1092, it was determined among the nobles to ask the king's leave that in all the churches prayers might be said that God would incline the heart of the king to make an appointment.[2] Anselm was desired to draw up a form of prayer. With great reluctance he consented. The king, who had given a mocking consent to the request of the nobles, exclaimed—"The Church may pray as much as it likes; I shall, nevertheless, do just as I please." On some one suggesting to him the holiness of Anselm, who had arranged the prayers, and saying he loved nothing but God—"Except," said Rufus, "the archbishopric of Canterbury." The other replied that he did not think that he in any way desired this. "He would run to it dancing and clapping his hands," said the king; "but by the holy face of Lucca, neither he nor any one else shall be archbishop at this time except myself."[3]

3. But from this defiant and blasphemous tone the sharp touch of dangerous illness caused the hardened king to recede. At the beginning of Lent William was lying sick at Gloucester, and, believing his end to be approaching, desired Anselm to be sent for to minister to him. The good abbot, who was happily staying near, at once came, and exhorted the king to confession and amendment of life. Rufus, under the influence of compunction, ordered the prisoners to be discharged from the dungeons,

[1] Church, *Life of St. Anselm*, p. 90.

[2] "Quod posteris mirum dictu fortasse videbitur."—Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, p. 15.

[3] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, pp. 15, 16.

promised to fill up the vacant churches, and undertook, if spared, to lead a good life for the future, and to govern with justice and mercy. Those who were around him, delighted with the salutary change, besought him at once to give evidence of its reality by appointing an Archbishop of Canterbury. Rufus consented, and very naturally nominated the abbot Anselm. All were rejoiced, but Anselm himself shrank from the honour with unfeigned and overpowering dismay, and it was at length almost by force that he was brought to yield.[1] The king freely promised him everything, but when he was restored to health all his promises were forgotten. Nay, as though in anger against himself for having weakly yielded for a moment, Rufus strove to make the state of things in England worse than it was before ;[2] and when exhorted by a well-meaning prelate to be warned by his illness to have more care for God in the future, "Know, O bishop," he replied, "that God shall never have any goodness from me on account of the evil which He has inflicted on me."

4. The king being in this temper, it was absolutely necessary that Anselm should have some definite understanding with him with regard to the possessions of the See of Canterbury, before he could consent to undertake the office of archbishop. At an interview with him he demanded first that all the lands held by Lanfranc should be made over to him ; secondly, that those which had been granted away before Lanfranc's time should be restored if the claim to them could be established ; thirdly, that the king should act by his advice in spiritual matters ; and lastly, that he should recognise Urban as Pope and not Clement. To the first of these demands Rufus agreed ; to the others he would say nothing. Afterwards, at Windsor, he begged of

[1] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, pp. 17, 18, gives a long account of the struggles of Anselm, which, knowing as he did what Rufus was, we may well believe to be sincere. On the same day on which Rufus appointed Anselm he also nominated Robert Bloet to the See of Lincoln. He was not consecrated till 1094.

[2] Eadmer, p. 19. "Omne malum quod rex fecerat, priusquam infirmatus fuerat, bonum visum est comparatione malorum quæ fecit ubi est sanitati redonatus."

Anselm not to press his claim to estates that had been alienated since Lanfranc's death for military service. To this request to him to consent to the spoliation of the See Anselm refused to listen, and determined, rather than yield to it, to refuse consecration. Then a great clamour was raised by the chief men of the State at the prospect of a still continuing vacancy of the Primacy. The king at length yielded, and at Winchester, before the Council of the land, Anselm was made the king's man for the whole archbishopric as Lanfranc had held it. On the 5th of September Anselm was received at Canterbury with the greatest demonstrations of joy; but on the very day on which he was enthroned in the archbishop's seat Ralph Flambard appeared, and commenced a suit against him[1] on the part of the king. This was enough to cast a damp on the general joy, and was a sad presage of the future. On December 4, 1093, Anselm was consecrated by the Archbishop of York, all the bishops of England except Worcester and Exeter taking part in the ceremony. When Walkeline, bishop of Winchester read the Act of Election, the church of Canterbury was found to be described therein as *totius Angliæ Metropolitana.* To this Archbishop Thomas objected, saying that these words altogether took away his rights, and the reasonableness of the objection being admitted, the word *Metropolitana* was changed to *Primas*, and under this character the consecration went forward.[2]

5. Anselm was no sooner consecrated than he was involved in bitter quarrels with the king. William wanted money for his war in Normandy, and the Primate was not willing to give what would seem like a simoniacal payment for his See. He offered, indeed, five hundred marks, but this was despised as insufficient, and Anselm then distributed it among the poor. To the archbishop's earnest request that William would summon a Council to devise some means for checking the fearful licentiousness of the period, and would nominate to the vacant abbacies, a contemptuous refusal was returned. William was waiting at

[1] "Placitum contra eum instituit."—Eadmer. The suit was probably against some of the archbishop's tenants for arrears.

[2] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, pp. 19-21 (ed. Selden).

Hastings for a fair wind to pass into Normandy, and all the bishops were with him to help him with their prayers. The king expressed his bitter hatred of the Primate, and desired him to depart. This Anselm at length did, hopeless as he must have been of obtaining any good thing from such a monarch.[1]

6. During the assembly of the bishops at Hastings in 1094, while the king was waiting for a fair wind, several pieces of ecclesiastical business were transacted. Before Anselm had departed in sorrow and indignation, he and his suffragan bishops (February 11) solemnly dedicated the church of the abbey which the Conqueror had vowed as a thank-offering to St. Martin if he should obtain the victory over Harold. Various difficulties had delayed the finishing of the abbey for some twenty years after its commencement,[2] and he who had vowed it was not allowed to witness the completion of his work. Its consecration is important in English Church history, because of the exemption from episcopal control which was granted to it. Battle Abbey became thus the first of the English monasteries which introduced the evil custom of exemptions, a custom which tended more than anything else to the overthrow of monasticism in the land. On the day following the consecration of the church dedicated to St. Martin,[3] Robert Bloet, the king's Chancellor, was consecrated to the bishopric of Lincoln. Bloet had been nominated by the king to the See of Lincoln, which had then been vacant nearly a year, at the same time that Anselm was nominated to Canterbury; but the Archbishop of York, secretly encouraged thereto by the king, revived his claims over the See of Lincoln;[4] and not until Bloet had given a large bribe to the king[5] would he force the northern Primate to

[1] Eadmer, pp. 23, 24. [2] See Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, iv. 407.

[3] See Mr. Dimock's note to Giraldus Cambrensis, vii. 31.

[4] Henric. Huntingdon, *Hist.*, f. 213 *b* (ed. Saville). It appears that the claims of York against Lincoln were twofold. The archbishop claimed parts of Lindsey as belonging to his diocese, and the whole See as a suffragan See of his province.

[5] Stubbs, *Act. Pontif. Ebor.*, p. 1708 (ed. Twysden), says one thousand pounds; Henry of Huntingdon, f. 213 (ed. Saville), five thousand.

yield his claim. The consecration was performed in the "church of St. Mary, which is within the castle itself."[1] At the same time and place also, a singular transaction took place. Herbert de Losingâ, bishop of Thetford, was arraigned for an attempt to go beyond seas to Pope Urban, in order to obtain absolution for simony. He had bought for himself the See of Thetford, and for his father the abbey of Hyde at Winchester. This would suffice to embitter Anselm against him. The king, on the other hand, who had received a thousand pounds for the transaction,[2] had no mind to have his dealings denounced at Rome, neither had he as yet made up his mind to recognise Urban as Pope. The unfortunate bishop, therefore, had both King and Primate against him, and was deprived of his pastoral staff.

7. On the return of William from Normandy, the quarrel between him and the Primate was renewed. Anselm desired to be allowed to go to Rome for the pall, but when he declared that he intended to demand it of Pope Urban, the king would not consent. This Pope, he said, had not as yet been recognised by him;[3] and it was the undoubted prerogative of the king to settle, in the case of a disputed election, who was to be accepted as Pope. Anselm maintained that he could recognise no other as Pope, that he had already recognised Pope Urban. He demanded that the Council of the English prelates and nobles should be assembled to settle this important question. A meeting of the great Council of the nation was accordingly held at Rockingham, on Mid-Lent Sunday (March 11, 1095). Anselm made a speech to the Assembly. He explained the point of difference between himself and the king, and declared that he had already recognised Urban

[1] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, p. 23.

[2] Roger de Hoveden, i. 148 (ed. Stubbs); Florent. Wigorn., ii. 33. William of Malmesbury (*De Gest. Pontif.*, p. 151) calls Losinga "Magnus in Anglia simoniæ fomes;" but he does not show him to have been worse than other prelates of his day. Farther on he tells us that he was penitent, that he received back his staff and became a good bishop, and builder of his cathedral.

[3] Eadmer, p. 25.

when abbot of Bec, and could not now withdraw his recognition.[1] The king, however, would not acknowledge Urban, and how was he, the archbishop, to combine loyalty to the Pope with obedience to the king? He desired the counsel of the bishops. The bishops' advice was that he should not attempt to run counter to the king. "Give up," they said, "this Urban, who can never be any advantage to you, cast away the yoke of servitude, and asserting your freedom as becomes an Archbishop of Canterbury, be ready to follow the king's directions." Anselm replied that he could never renounce Urban. His reply was carried to the king by William de St. Carileph, bishop of Durham, who acted as the spokesman of the bishops, and the chief supporter of the king. In return, the archbishop was informed that by thus creating a Pope of his own in opposition to the Crown, he was, in fact, guilty of treason. He demanded that this charge against him should be brought to the proof, and declared that he was ready to defend himself. But the bishops were not disposed to constitute themselves judges of their Primate, and the nobles showed rather a disposition to support him. The king then, having made the bishops formally renounce all obedience to the Primate, declared him outlawed, and swore that from henceforth he could never hold him for archbishop or spiritual father.[2]

8. Being thus put out of the protection of the laws, Anselm desired to be allowed to leave the country, but this was denied to him. The king, changing his tactics, instead of attacking him for recognising Urban, whom he had not himself acknowledged, now recognised and heavily bribed Urban, obtaining by this means the despatch of the pall by the hands of a papal Legate for himself to bestow upon the archbishop if he would submit to his will. He attempted, indeed, to obtain from the Pope the deposition of Anselm, but this he could not obtain. Having now the pall in his hands, the king endeavoured to exact from the Primate the pay-

[1] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, p. 26. The fullest account of these transactions is to be found in Eadmer, who was present at the Council.

[2] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, 26-31.

ment of a sum of money as its price. Anselm refused.[1] At any rate Anselm would sue to him for the gift of the pall. In this too Anselm was resolute. It was a papal gift and privilege, he could not take it from the king. Thus baffled at all points, the king yielded. The pall was laid on the altar of the church of Canterbury, and from thence was taken by Anselm and assumed with great devotion.[2] The king resented his defeat bitterly. Anselm's chief opponent, William de St. Carileph, bishop of Durham, being regarded by Rufus as having failed, was made to experience such cruel ill-usage from him that it hastened his death.[3] The bishops who had taken so strong a part against the Primate now desired to be reconciled to him, and he exhibited no angry feelings towards them. He had throughout contended for right and principle, and though his claim to recognise a Pope whom his sovereign and Church had not recognised may be held to be of doubtful justice,[4] yet in the real ground of William's hostility to him—his refusal to pay money for his appointment and privileges—all must sympathise with Anselm.

9. After a short lull the quarrel between the king and archbishop broke out again; and, as before, the cause of it was the question of money. Anselm had indeed readily furnished his contingent of the sum raised to pay the mortgage of Normandy to William, while his brother Robert went on the Crusade. He had even taken the strong measure of borrowing part of the sum required from the treasure of the church of Canterbury.[5] But the men whom

[1] "Negavit se quicquam propter hoc daturum quia parvi æstimaret beneficium cujus amplitudinem ipsi tanti penderent."—Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pont.*, p. 90.

[2] June 10, 1095. Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, 31-34; Flor. Wigorn., ii. 37; Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pontif.*, 86-91.

[3] See Notes and Illustrations to this Chapter.

[4] England generally inclined towards the Antipope. "In Guibertum pro metu regis inclinatior."—Willelm. Malmesb. "It was a fair question to men with the inherited convictions of the religion of that age. The claim which William maintained had come down to him from his father, who had insisted on it resolutely, with Lanfranc's sanction or acquiescence, even against Gregory VII."—Church, *Life of St. Anselm*, p. 199.

[5] Eadmer, p. 35.

he had furnished to the king for his Welsh expedition had been insufficiently equipped, and a sum was demanded of the archbishop for compensation. Anselm's reply was a request for leave to go to Rome. It does not appear that there was any special reason for this request, except that the archbishop desired to get out of the way of the royal exactions.[1] The bishops remonstrated against it, and the king refused his permission. But Anselm persisted in demanding leave, and at length he was allowed to depart, but without a formal sanction for his going; and, in fact, at the last moment he was subjected to the indignity of having his goods searched to see if he was carrying away any of the king's treasure. For nearly three years Anselm continued uselessly hanging about the papal court, or living in Italian monasteries. He was courted and caressed by the Pope, styled *alterius orbis Papa*,[2] but he got no substantial help, and so he wasted his time until the death of King William. This betaking himself to Rome when things went against him was hardly worthy of the bold stand which the archbishop had before made against simoniacal exactions, and was the beginning of that miserable system of papal appeals which more than anything else inflicted deadly injury on the Church of England.[3]

10. Before Anselm left England for his long foreign sojourn he had taken part in an important episcopal act connected with the Church of Ireland. In 1096 Waterford was erected into a See, and Murtach the king, Donald bishop of Dublin, and Dermot the king's brother, together with the clergy and people of Waterford, addressed a letter

[1] Henry of Huntingdon says he went "quia nihil recti rex pravus in regno suo fieri permittebat."—f. 216 (ed. Saville).

[2] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pontif.*, p. 100. This was said at the Council of Bari, when Anselm was specially called upon by the Pope to argue against the Greek doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit.

[3] "And thus began that system of appeals to Rome, and of inviting foreign interference in our home concerns, which grew to such a mischievous and scandalous height, and Anselm was the beginner of it." —Church's *Anselm*, p. 223. The details of Anselm's foreign sojourn are given at much length in Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, b. ii., and William of Malmesbury, *De Gest. Pont.*, pp. 92-102 (ed. Hamilton).

to Anselm, praying him to consecrate as bishop of the new See Malchus, a monk of the monastery of Winchester. Anselm, after having examined the bishop-elect and found him competent, complied with their request, and consecrated him at Canterbury, December 27, 1096, being assisted by Ralph, bishop of Chichester, and Gundulf, bishop of Rochester.[1]

11. The archbishop having left his post, and the other bishops being without spirit or courage to resist the king's exactions, a most complete system of organised confiscation was adopted towards the Church revenues. Ralph Flambard, the great spoiler, who had shown singular dexterity in the work of robbing the Church, was advanced, after the death of William de St. Carileph, to be bishop of Durham, and the king appointed him "general impleader and exactor of the whole kingdom."[2] "By many and various ways," says the chronicler, "both before his elevation to the episcopate and when bishop, did he afflict both small and great alike, and this he continued to do quite up to the death of the king, for on the very day on which the king was slain he held in his hands the revenues of the See of Canterbury and the Sees of Winchester and Salisbury."[3] Such was the state of miserable spoliation and oppression from which the arrow shot by an unknown hand in the New Forest delivered the Church of England.

12. The great contest into which Anselm now entered with the Crown is distinctly connected with his presence at the Council held at the Lateran in Rome in the year 1099. At this the burning question between the Popes and the Emperors—that, namely, of lay investiture—was brought forward for discussion. The right claimed for the ruler of giving the ring and the crozier to the bishop, and thus making him "the man" of the emperor or king, found, as might be expected, little support in a council of eccle-

[1] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, p. 36. The consecration of Archbishop Samuel to Dublin, said by some to have taken place previously to this, could not very well have been done at the time alleged, as it is Donald, not Samuel, who applies for the consecration of Malchus.

[2] Flor. Wigorn., ii. 46.

[3] *Ib.* Besides eleven abbacies; A.-S. Chron., ii. 204.

siastics. Excommunications and anathemas were freely uttered against all those who gave and all those who accepted lay investiture. The clergy declared that it was "a thing too execrable that the hands which had been so highly honoured as to be allowed to do that which no angel could do, namely, to create God the Creator, and offer Him for the redemption of the world, should be degraded to become the servants of those hands which were polluted by obscenity or stained by rapines and the unjust shedding of blood."[1] A general shout of "Be it so! be it so!" was raised by the Council. Under the influence of this excited feeling, and fully possessed with the strength of the papal views on the matter, Anselm returned to England on the invitation of the new sovereign, Henry I. (September 23, 1100).

13. Henry, a prince of great ability, and anxious to strengthen his title, which, while his elder brother lived, was insecure, saw the absolute necessity of making some concessions to the Church as well as the State on his accession. The policy of William, which had been established and systematised by Ralph Flambard, of obtaining for the king a regular revenue from Church benefices, was now deliberately abandoned. In the first article of his Charter of Liberties Henry declares—"I make the holy Church of God free. I will neither sell nor put to farm [its property]. I will not, when an archbishop, or bishop, or abbot dies, take anything from the domain of the Church, or from its men, until a successor enters upon it."[2] But there was no promise of giving up the Crown's right of appointment to ecclesiastical offices, and of investing the holders of them in their privileges and jurisdictions, so as to make them the king's men. Anselm, therefore, fresh from the violent enthusiasm of the Roman Council, was brought face to face with this claim, which was held in such utter abomination at Rome. He himself was in a difficult position to dispute it. He had acquiesced in it at the time of his own appointment, and had received investiture from William II. He had accepted the system which had been sanctioned by his pre-

[1] Flor. Wigorn., ii. 43.

[2] Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 97.

decessor Lanfranc. How was he now to act against that which he had previously tolerated?

14. Anselm's first relations with King Henry were very friendly. He took vigorously his part against his brother Robert, and was able to influence the nobles so as to keep them faithful to their oaths sworn to Henry. He sanctioned his marriage with Edith, daughter of the king of Scotland, who had the blood of the old English kings in her veins, but about whose marriage there was a difficulty, as she had been an inhabitant of a nunnery, though without actually taking the veil. But the demand made by the king on him for homage Anselm at once stoutly refused. He declared that he would only be guided by what had been ordained by the Pope. If the king were ready to accept this, well and good; if not, he could not remain in England.[1] The king was very indignant, but Anselm's support was necessary to him, and it was agreed that messengers should be sent to Rome to ascertain the Pope's decision on the case. Paschal had succeeded Urban on the papal throne, but his policy was the same. He returned, after some delay, a letter to the king, in which he asserts the highest claims for the spiritual authority, and declares that he will not tolerate the king's claims to nominate to Church preferments and to invest ecclesiastics in them. This letter was read at the Whitsuntide Council (1101), and caused great indignation. Henry was urged to demand that the archbishop should become "his man," and promise to consecrate those whom he should appoint to Sees, or else be banished. Anselm replied that he could do nothing, except what the Pope allowed, without incurring excommunication. "What is that to me?" said the king; "I will not lose the customs of my predecessors, nor will I endure in my kingdom any one who is not my subject." Upon this Anselm quietly retired, saying that he would await the event in patience. The archbishop had not long remained in quiet when letters from the king reached him of a friendly tone, desiring another interview with him. They met at Winchester, and it was mutually agreed to send another embassy to the Pope, three bishops being

[1] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, p. 56.

sent on the king's part, and two monks for the archbishop. When this embassy returned, bringing letters from the Pope both for the archbishop and the king, a great Council was held at London. Anselm was formally called upon to accept "the customs of the fathers." He replied that he would be guided by the Pope's letters. "The letters are not the question," said the king; "will you or will you not submit?" In fact, the Pope's letter to the king, with many praises for what he had done in remedying the mischiefs of the last reign, had yet refused to concede the point of the investitures. But the bishops who had been the king's envoys declared that, though the Pope had thought it necessary to write this, they had nevertheless been privately informed that, if the king would act well in other matters, the Pope would not trouble him about the investitures. This the two monks denied, and appealed to the written judgment of the Pope. The bishops, however, were firm, and they had the support of the Council. Both sides adhered positively to their views, and it was determined to send a third time to Rome. The probability is, not that the bishops reported falsely, but that the Pope had been guilty of a duplicity not altogether unknown at Rome.[1]

15. The king appears to have been satisfied at the turn which events had taken. Perhaps he only wished to gain time. However, he proceeded to act on what he held to be his right. He gave the pastoral staff to two of his clerks, appointing Roger, his Chancellor, to the See of Salisbury, and another Roger, the head of his kitchen,[2] to that of Hereford. Anselm was also allowed to do that which he had long desired to do, viz. to hold a council. About Michaelmas 1102 there met at Westminster, in St. Peter's church, a general council of the bishops[3] and abbots of the

[1] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, pp. 55-66. Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pontif.*, pp. 104-109. See Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops*, ii. 248.

[2] Lardesarium suum.—Eadmer.

[3] The bishops present were Gerard of York, Maurice of London, William (elect) of Winchester, Robert of Lincoln, Samson of Worcester, Robert of Chester, John of Bath, Herbert of Norwich, Ralph of Chichester, Gundulf of Rochester, Hervey of Bangor, and the two clerks lately nominated to Sees—Roger of Salisbury and Roger of Hereford. It

realm, together with the king and chief nobles, who attended at Anselm's desire; inasmuch as the correction of morals, at which the council aimed, would thus be better promoted. The council ordained twenty-nine canons as follows:—(1) That bishops do not keep secular courts of pleas; that they be apparelled not as laymen but as becomes religious persons, and have honest men to bear testimony to their conversation. (2) That archdeaconries be not let to farm. (3) That archdeacons be deacons. (4) That no archdeacon, priest, deacon, or canon marry a wife, or retain her if married;[1] that every subdeacon be under the same law, though he be not a canon, if he hath married a wife after he had made profession of chastity. (5) That a priest who has illicit intercourse with a woman be not a lawful priest; let him not celebrate mass, or be heard by others if he do. (6) That none be ordained subdeacon, or to any degree above that, without professing chastity. (7) That sons of priests be not heirs to their fathers' churches. (8) That no clergymen be reeves or agents to secular persons, nor judges in cases of blood. (9) That priests go not to drinking bouts, nor drink to pegs. (10) That priests' clothes be all of one colour, and their shoes plain. (11) That monks and clergy who have forsaken their order do either return or be excommunicate. (12) That the tonsure of clerks be visible. (13) That tithes be paid to the Church only. (14) That churches or prebends be not bought. (15) That new chapels be not made without the consent of the bishop. (16) That churches be not consecrated till all necessaries be provided for the priest and the church. (17) That abbots do not make knights, and that they eat and sleep in the same

is said by Johnson that Hervey of Bangor was the first Welsh bishop who ever attended an English synod. He represented himself to have been driven out of his See by secular violence. He was soon afterwards made bishop of Ely.—Johnson, *English Canons*, ii. 25.

[1] This was a great advance on Lanfranc's canon of 1076, and was the first deliberate attempt to make the secular clergy put away their wives. It was not, however, successful. Henry of Huntingdon says very wisely, "Quod quibusdam mundissimum visum est, quibusdam periculosum, ne dum munditias viribus majores appeterent, in immunditias horribiles, ad Christiani nominis summum dedecus, inciderent." —f. 217 (ed. Saville).

house with their monks, except in case of necessity. (18) That monks enjoin penance to none without their abbot's consent, and that abbots give no license to enjoin it to any but such whose souls are entrusted to their cure. (19) That monks be not godfathers, nor nuns godmothers. (20) That monks do not hire farms. (21) That monks do not take the impropriations of churches without the bishop's consent, nor so rob those which are given them of their revenues that the priests who serve them be in want of necessaries. (22) That promises of marriage made between man and woman without witness be null, if either party deny them. (23) That they who wear long hair be so clipped that part of their ears be visible and their eyes not covered. (24) That they who are related in the seventh degree be not coupled in marriage, nor cohabit if married; and if any who is conscious of this crime do not discover it, let him acknowledge himself an accomplice in the incest. (25) That corpses be not carried out of their parishes to be buried, so that the priest of their parish lose his just dues. (26) That no one attribute reverence [1] or sanctity to a dead body, or a fountain, or other thing (as is sometimes done to our knowledge), without the bishop's authority. (27) That no one exercise that wicked trade, which has hitherto been practised in England, of selling men like beasts. (28) Those guilty of sodomitical crime, and those who voluntarily aided them, were struck with heavy anathema, till, by confession and penance, they had deserved absolution; and it was ordained that if any ecclesiastical person were guilty of this crime, he be never admitted to any higher order, and that he be degraded from that in which he was; if any layman, that he be deprived of all lawful dignity in the whole realm, and that no one but the bishop presume to absolve him except he were a vowed regular. (29) That the aforesaid excommunication be published in all churches throughout England every Lord's-day.[2] With this last stipulation Anselm was obliged soon to dispense; so great, says Eadmer, was the number of transgressors in every class of men. In addition

[1] Eadmer has "ne quis *temerariâ novitate*," which is left out in Johnson's translation.

[2] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, 67-68; Johnson's *Eng. Canons*, ii. 24-28.

to making canons, the council also proceeded to strike at some notorious offenders. Three abbots—Guy of Pershore, Wimund of Tavistock, and Aldwin of Ramsey—were deposed for simony. Three others who had got possession of abbeys, though not yet instituted—namely, Godric of Peterborough, Haymo of Cerne, and Egelric of Middleton—were removed for the same offence. For other offences Richard of Ely, Robert of St. Edmund's, and the abbot of Michelney, were deposed.[1]

16. The bold stand made by Anselm against the king's prerogative was not without its effect on the bishops and clergy of England. In the former reign they had been miserably subservient to the oppressions and spoliations of Rufus; but now even those who had received promotion from the king began to assume an attitude against his claims. The independence of the spiritualty of the temporal power, advocated with such extreme violence at Rome, was a fascinating and attractive doctrine to Churchmen, and Anselm was already becoming a hero in the eyes of his brethren. Thus William Giffard, nominated by the king to the bishopric of Winchester, refused to be invested by the king. Henry, however, was determined that William, who was a statesman much trusted by him, should be made bishop. The Winchester chapter was equally desirous to obtain him, and so the king "connived," says Eadmer, at his receiving the staff from Anselm.[2] But when the Primate was required to consecrate him, together with the bishops-designate of Salisbury and Hereford, he positively declined. He would consecrate William, he said, but not the others. Henry then ordered that the consecration should be done by Gerard, Archbishop of York. Upon this the designate of Hereford, Reinhelm,[3] brought back to the king his staff and ring, declining to be consecrated by Gerard against the wishes of Anselm. The king drove him from the court in

[1] Eadmer, *u. s.* "And many there, both French and English, lost their staves and authority which they had unjustly acquired or lived on with iniquity."—A.-S. Chron., ii. 206.

[2] *Hist. Nov.*, p. 69.

[3] The king's "larderer," Roger, had died before consecration. Reinhelm was a clerk of the royal chapel.

anger. Archbishop Gerard was now prepared to consecrate William to Winchester and Roger to Salisbury, but the courage of the former failed him ; his conscience would not allow him to receive consecration in what he thought an irregular manner.[1] He declared to the bishops assembled for the service in St. Paul's Cathedral that he would rather be spoiled of all than thus be hallowed. The service was broken off. The bishops, in confusion, reported the matter to the king. William was despoiled of all his possessions and banished ; but the people extolled his name as that of a confessor for the truth, and cried shame upon the bishops. Anselm had won a great victory.[2]

17. The king, however, had no thought of yielding, and was determined to make a strong effort to subdue Anselm. Appearing at Canterbury in Lent 1103, he demanded of him that he should accept the *paternæ consuetudines*, and do him homage. Those about the king believed that he intended inflicting some serious punishment on Anselm if he refused. But the Primate was firm. He could not do it unless the Pope allowed. The messengers were now come back from Rome. He desired the king to inspect their letters. Henry would not look at the letters. "What has the Pope to do with my concerns?" he cried; "that which my predecessors enjoyed is mine. If any one takes it away, he is my enemy." "I desire to take away nothing," replied Anselm, "but I would rather lose my head than yield in this."[3] The king saw that the only way out of the difficulty was to get Anselm himself to go to Rome, where he might hear from the Pope advice very different from that which the Pope wrote to him in formal documents, and similar to that which the Pope had doubtless spoken to the three bishops. Anselm consented to go. Arrived at Rome, he found William Warelwast an envoy from the king to oppose him. William was a dexterous envoy, and

[1] Tam nefando ministerio.—Eadmer.

[2] Eadmer, p. 69 ; Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pont.*, p. 110. Roger, bishop of Salisbury, thus left alone, "prædicandâ prudentiâ ita rem temperavit ut nec regem irritaret nec archiepiscopo injuriam faceret."—Willelm. Malmesb.

[3] Eadmer, p. 70.

represented the great benefits which would accrue to the See of Rome by favouring the king of England, at the same time that he used other methods of persuasion. But the Pope was unable to yield in a matter on which such great interest was excited in men's minds. He wrote to the king, indeed, a friendly letter by way of keeping the matter open, but he would not sanction his investitures.[1] Then, on the way back, Anselm was informed by William Warelwast, that unless he would return to England to be the "king's man," the king did not desire his return. Having ascertained this to be the case, the archbishop remained at Lyons, and the king seized the estates of the See, appointing as receivers two of the archbishop's men.[2]

18. Again the archbishop condemns himself to a long period of inactivity and uselessness rather than yield a point, which doubtless he held to be of high importance for the welfare of the Church, but which should hardly have been allowed to stand between him and some attempts to reform the grievous moral and ecclesiastical corruptions of the land in which he held the highest religious rank. He remained waiting a year and a half at Lyons, while the Church in England was suffering from every sort of mischief.[3] He was hoping that the Pope would excommunicate Henry; but the Pope had substantial reasons which induced him not to do this. Then Anselm himself determined to return to England and pronounce the excommunication. Henry, not desiring this, contrived to meet him abroad, spoke him fair, restored to him the revenues of his See, but still would not yield as to the investiture. Once more a reference to Rome was determined on, and during the long time in which the answer was delayed, Anselm retired to his old monastery at Bec. Here a letter given by Eadmer reached him from England, which described in terms, sufficient, one would suppose, to move the firmness of the Primate, the

[1] See Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops*, ii. 255.

[2] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, pp. 70-76; Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pontif.*, 110-114.

[3] The Pope, though upholding Anselm, reminded him how grievously the Church was suffering from his absence.—Eadmer, p. 79.

miserable state of things in the English Church. The writer declares that the point in dispute between Anselm and the king appeared to every sane man in England to be nothing at all, but rather a contrivance of the devil to vex the English Church. Meantime the possessions of the Church were being plundered, and the service of God neglected. The clergy were given over to all iniquity. The laity contracted marriages with their near relatives in spite of the Church. The enactments of the late council against abominable crimes, and the perpetrators of them, were altogether a dead letter. Things were worse than could be shown by writing. Men freely said that all this was the archbishop's fault, inasmuch as he who could have done most to abate these evils kept away for a mere nothing. The writer solemnly appeals to the archbishop whether such proceedings were justifiable.[1]

19. Meantime, though the most important disciplinary directions of the Council of Westminster remained a dead letter, those by means of which money might be extorted from the unfortunate clergy were not allowed to sleep. The clergy had been ordered to put away their wives, but they had not done so, and had no intention of doing so. Upon this, the king inflicted a heavy fine upon all married clergy, allowing them thus to purchase immunity from the decrees of the council by payments to him. But this source of revenue not proving sufficient, the king inflicted a fine upon all parishes, and for this the parson of the parish was made responsible.[2] A widespread trouble was caused. Two hundred presbyters in albs and stoles, with their feet bare, appeared before the king and besought his mercy. They were roughly repulsed. The bishops in their despair addressed Anselm, begging him to return, but the impracticable archbishop merely answered that he was waiting for the envoys from Rome. He wrote, however, to the king, remonstrating with him as to his treatment of the clergy. But the king would not admit himself to be in the wrong. At length the messengers returned from Rome. The Pope, evidently desiring a compromise, bade Anselm to release from excommunication

[1] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, p. 81. [2] Eadmer, *Ib.*, p. 83.

those who had received lay investiture, and those nobles who upheld the royal policy. Anselm was clearly intended to return to England and live at peace with king and bishops.[1] Henry now visited the archbishop at Bec, and some friendly intercourse having taken place between them, at length (1106) Anselm consented to return to his See, from which he had been for three years very unjustifiably absent.

20. Now at last the settlement of the weary dispute came. "On the first of August" (1107), says Eadmer, "an assembly of bishops, abbots, and nobles, was made at London in the king's palace.[2] For three days continuously the matter of the investitures to churches was discussed between the king and the bishops, Anselm being absent, some striving that the king should make them according to the manner of his father and brother, and not according to the precept and the obedience due to the Pope. For the Pope standing firm in the sentence which had been promulgated on this, had conceded the matter of homage which Pope Urban had forbidden equally with investitures, and by this means had got the king to yield about investitures. Then in the presence of Anselm, the multitude of people standing by, the king agreed and enacted that from henceforth no one should be invested in England in a bishopric or abbey by the giving of a pastoral staff or a ring by the king, or any lay hand, and Anselm agreed that no person elected to prelacy should be debarred from consecration on account of the homage which he should do to the king. These things being so settled, in almost all the churches of England, which had been long widowed of their pastors, by the counsel of Anselm and the nobles, without any investiture of pastoral staff or ring, fathers were instituted by the king."[3] This compromise having

[1] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, p. 87.

[2] This, says Professor Stubbs, "must have been a very large gathering, and here and during the other councils of this reign, we may observe a peculiar mark of our ecclesiastical history, the king holding his Council at Westminster, while the archbishop holds his at the same city, a precedent for the coincident summoning of Parliament and Convocation in later days."—Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 374.

[3] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, p. 91.

been effected, the consecration of the bishops, about which so much difficulty had arisen, immediately followed. William, elect of Winchester, Roger of Salisbury, Reinelm of Hereford, and William Warelwast, who had conducted all the king's negotiations with the Pope, now elect of Exeter, were consecrated by Anselm, Gerard of York, Robert of Lincoln, John of Bath, Herbert of Norwich, Robert of Chester, Ralph of Chichester, and Ralph of Durham.[1]

21. The compromise thus effected between the King and the Pope, and the Primate who represented the Pope's policy, was a judicious one, and in fact the only one possible under the circumstances. In face of the rising power of the Church, and the jealousy of lay control which had been developed, it was impossible for the king to keep in his hands the semi-ecclesiastical investiture of bishops by the ring and staff; but by securing the oath of homage he still ensured their being English subjects. Henry also surrendered the right of nominating to Sees independently of chapters, but by ordaining that the chapters should make the election in the court, he secured their choosing the candidate whom he himself might favour. The archbishop might now hold councils when he pleased, but a necessary preliminary was that the king's consent must be obtained before the assembly could meet or legislate. The Pope's jurisdiction was recognised in England, but no Legate was allowed to visit England without royal license.[2] Under the circumstances, as much was done as was possible and perhaps needful to save the ancient right of royal supremacy, while the liberty granted to Churchmen was sufficient to satisfy the scruples which had of late assumed such large dimensions.

[1] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, p. 92. It seems startling to find the notorious miscreant Ralph Flambard calmly acting with Anselm in consecrating the new bishops. Gerard, Archbishop of York, made a promise of allegiance to Anselm. That is to say, he promised that as archbishop he would pay him the same obedience which he had already vowed to him as bishop of Hereford. [2] See Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 317.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

WILLIAM DE ST. CARILEPH, BISHOP OF DURHAM.

WILLIAM DE ST. CARILEPH is a personage of some importance as the builder of the great cathedral of Durham. He was a Norman monk (St. Calais, in the diocese of Mans), and afterwards abbot of St. Vincentius in the same diocese. Being a good man of business and a fluent speaker, he obtained from William I. the bishopric of Durham (1081), was in high favour under William Rufus, and succeeded Robert Bloet, bishop of Lincoln, as chancellor. He was involved in the plots of Odo of Bayeux, and had to fly from England. After two years' exile he was, however, allowed to return. Henceforth (according to William of Malmesbury) he courted the king most assiduously, and adapted himself to every temper of the royal mind. Thus he took occasion of the king's anger against Anselm to make himself the leader of the party of bishops against him. The firmness of Anselm, however, foiled him, and the king's anger fell upon him. At the court at Gloucester, being absent, he was ordered to attend. A message was brought that he was suffering from illness. The king swore he was only feigning. Then the unfortunate bishop, more dead than alive, made his appearance. His brethren, instead of cheering him, discussed the place of his burial, and thought he ought to be buried within the church of St. Cuthbert, which he was rebuilding so magnificently. This honour he disclaimed with his dying breath, but desired to be buried in the chapter-house (1096). He introduced monks at Durham, and conferred special privileges on the prior.—Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pont.*, 272.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE LEGATINE AUTHORITY IN ENGLAND.

1107-1135.

1. Council of London, 1108. 2. Foundation of the See of Ely, 1109. 3. Thomas II. of York and Anselm. 4. Death and character of Anselm. 5. Archbishop Ralph and the Pope. 6. The claim to send a Legate to England. 7. Thurstan treacherously obtains consecration to York from the Pope. 8. Renewed abortive attempt to send a Legate to England. 9. Archbishop William concedes the point of the establishment of a Legate. 10. The Legate Cardinal John of Crema. 11. Council of Westminster, 1125. 12. Archbishop of Canterbury becomes Papal Legate. 13. Council of Westminster, 1127. 14. Another council (1129) on clerical matrimony; the king sells licenses to the married clergy. 15. Fountains Abbey founded—the Cistercian order. 16. Foundation of the See of Carlisle—Austin canons. 17. Death of Henry I.—His policy towards the Church.

1. THERE can be no question that the work which Anselm had done had been salutary for raising the character of the Church, and the dignity of the episcopal office—in danger as it was of falling into the degraded condition of a mere feudal service of the king. "The king was strongly and solemnly reminded that he owed an account for the persons whom he appointed bishops; they were not merely his creatures; they were not merely elevated and promoted on the terms on which he made a knight or a baron; the office was not his in the sense that he could sell it."[1] And a decided improvement in the state of the Church of England may be traced during the greater portion of the reign of Henry. But there were many among the clergy who regarded with anything but satisfaction this attempt to regulate by the new discipline of Rome the old habits and customs of the Church of England. This was especially the case with respect to clerical matrimony. The sweeping

[1] Church, *Life of Anselm*, p. 291.

canon passed in 1102, ordering all priests to put away their wives, had been but little regarded. The king had used the resistance of the clergy as the means of extorting fines, but this also had not availed to put a stop to clerical matrimony. "Many presbyters," says Eadmer, "making light of the statutes of the Council of London, and of the vengeance which the king had exercised towards them, still retained their wives, or indeed married wives, which they had not done before."[1] Anselm was very anxious to restrain this liberty, and the king, seconding his views, summoned a council of the magnates of the kingdom and the bishops to meet at London (1108), which ordained as follows: — (1.) That priests, deacons, and subdeacons should live chastely and keep no women in their houses but such as were nearest of kin to them, according to the decrees of the Council of Nice. (2.) That such as have kept or taken wives since the prohibition of the Council of London, and have celebrated mass, do so wholly discard them as not to be with or meet them in any house knowingly; and that the women may not live on any ground belonging to the Church. (3.) If they have any honest occasion to speak with them, let it be done without doors before lawful witnesses. (4.) If any of them (the clergy) are accused by two or three lawful witnesses, or by the public report of the parishioners, to have transgressed this statute, let him, if a priest, make his purgation by six witnesses, if a deacon by four, if a sub-deacon by two; and if he fail, let him be deemed a transgressor. (5.) Let such priests as choose to live with wives in contempt of God's altar and their holy orders be deprived of their office and benefice, and put out of the choir, being first pronounced infamous. (6.) And if a priest celebrate mass and do not leave his wife, let him be excommunicated unless he come to satisfaction within eight days after summons. (7.) Let archdeacons and canons be liable to the same sentence as to their leaving their wives, and as to the censure to be passed if they transgress. (8.) All archdeacons shall swear that they will not take money to tolerate men in transgressing this statute, nor for tolerating priests whom they know to

[1] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, p. 94.

have wives, in celebrating mass, or in having vicars; and if they shall hear them charged with this, they shall inquire into the truth. Deans shall, in like manner, swear to these things, and they who refuse to swear shall lose their offices. (9.) Priests who choose to leave their wives and to serve God and His holy altar, shall have vicars to officiate for them during the forty days in which they are to desist from their office, and are to have penance enjoined them at the bishop's discretion. (10.) All the movable goods of the clergy who offend after this shall be given to the bishop, as well as the concubines with their goods, as adulterous persons.[1] The last clause of these decrees is wanting in the report of Florence of Worcester. It is to be hoped it was not really sanctioned by the council. By the old law of England the adulterous woman became the slave of the bishop.[2] This would therefore put it into the power of the bishop to sell the wives of the clergy as slaves.

2. One of the last important transactions in which Anselm was concerned was the forwarding the arrangements for the creation of the See of Ely. The account of this reads somewhat differently in Eadmer, and in William of Malmesbury and the monkish historian of the *Historia Eliensis*.[3] According to the former, the large and unmanageable size of the See of Lincoln would seem to have been a matter for consideration at the council between the king and nobles, and the Primate and the bishops. It was thought that it would be "conducive to the cause of Christianity,"[4] that from the diocese of Lincoln enough should be taken to make a See, of which the abbey of Ely should be the cathedra. Anselm wrote to the Pope recommending the plan, and Robert, bishop of Lincoln, being willing to consent to it for an equivalent which he received, the matter was accomplished. But according to the monastic account and that of William of Malmesbury, whose predilections did not incline him to regard the putting a famous monastery under the power of a bishop as an unmixed good, the matter

[1] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, p. 95; Flor. Wigorn., *Chron.*, ii. 53.

[2] Johnson, *Eng. Canons*, ii. 33.

[3] Printed in *Anglia Sacra*, vol. i.

[4] "Ratio Christianitatis id utile fore suadebat."

reads differently. In this view the foundation of the See was due to the ambitious machinations of "one Hervey," as William of Malmesbury calls him, who had been bishop of Bangor, but who had left his See in the hope of getting an increase of wealth, alleging as a pretence that he could not agree with his Welsh neighbours.[1] He was assigned by the king as acting abbot to the monastery of Ely, and recommended himself so well to the monks that they desired to have him their abbot for a continuance. Hervey suggested to them that it would be greatly to the honour of the society to become the chapter of a bishop, and the monks assenting, Hervey obtained the sanction of the king, and induced him to direct the bishop of Lincoln to consent to it, "the royal liberality giving him that which was not its own, viz. a vill belonging to Ely, Spaldwick by name."[2] Upon this, Hervey, having obtained the Pope's consent, was enthroned first bishop of Ely, 1109.[3]

3. The closing days of Anselm's life were troubled by a dispute with Thomas II. elected Archbishop of York in succession to Gerard. Both Thomas himself and the canons of York were anxious that the northern Primate should be spared the profession of canonical obedience to Canterbury. This was sought to be accomplished by delaying the consecration of Thomas, as it was thought that Anselm's life was drawing near to its close. With him at Canterbury there could be no hope of evasion, but during the vacancy of the See, or with a new occupant, the matter might perhaps be managed. Thus Thomas delayed, on one pretence or another, to apply for consecration. He pleads his poverty, then that he had sent to Rome for the pall, and must await its arrival, then the opposition of his canons. Anselm saw clearly through all these devices, and in order to guard against the possibility of their success charged solemnly all his suffragans that in case his death

[1] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pont.*, p. 325. [2] *Ib.*, *u. s.*

[3] Though Eadmer makes the arrangement of the See independent of Hervey's machinations, he says of his appointment, "quod quidem ut adipisci mereretur multâ prece, multis multarum rerum promissionibus, multorum quoque officiorum exhibitionibus, vix post obitum strenuissimi Anselmi obtinuit."—*Hist. Nov.*, p. 104.

should happen before the consecration of Thomas, they were not to consecrate him without the due profession. This prudent precaution was completely successful. The Primate died before Thomas was consecrated, but all the bishops remaining firm to the charge which Anselm had given them, and being supported by the king, Thomas was obliged to make the required profession.[1]

4. The life of the great Primate was now come to its close. He died on April 21, 1109, exhibiting in his last illness much devotion and charity. Anselm was one of the greatest prelates with whom the English Church has been adorned. He was one of the most learned men and deepest thinkers of his age. No breath of slander could assail his morals. His earnestness and devotion were beautified by tolerance and gentleness, which attracted even his enemies. His ecclesiastical policy was the result of full conviction, and was all founded on principle, and while it did much to enslave the English Church, it also did much to purify and elevate it. How vast was the interval between Anselm, bringing all things into subjection to the Pope, and his contemporary Ralph Flambard, scheming to make the Church a mere tributary appanage of the Crown. Both may be held to be wrong, but what a difference between the morality and aims of one wrong-doer and the other! The weak point in Anselm's character, while it was also his strength as a partisan, was that he was a man of one idea. While he was contending for the claims of the Church in investitures, he could think and care for nothing else. A great part of his primacy was spent abroad, though the English Church with its grievous corruptions needed above all things such a governor. If he could not have his own way on what he had set his heart, he would do nothing. Even at the very last, in the dispute with Thomas, elect of York, he wrote to the Pope that if Thomas should gain his point he would leave England for good.[2] His absence from England during the reign of Rufus seems due to pique rather than to principle. Anselm could not yield. The

[1] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, 97-104.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 99. For an account of Anselm's writings, see Notes and Illustrations to this Chapter.

claims of expediency had no weight with him. Such a character is great and noble, but falls short in the important point of doing good in its generation.[1]

5. After the death of Anselm Henry imitated the evil example of his brother Rufus, and kept the primatial See vacant for no less than five years. In another point, too, he seems to have imitated the bad policy of the two preceding kings. In all the appointments made by him to abbacies or Sees he studiously avoided giving any preferment to a man of English race. "If he were an Englishman," says Eadmer, "no amount of virtue could cause him to be judged worthy of honour."[2] At length, after five years' delay, the general clamour of all the chief men of the State compelled the king to provide a successor to Anselm. A great council was summoned at Windsor (April 26, 1114). The king desired to appoint Faricius, abbot of Abingdon. The council desired to have a secular clerk. A compromise was effected by the election of Ralph, bishop of Rochester, who had been an abbot, and was a person generally popular with all classes.[3] The election having been regularly made, a deputation of the Canterbury monks was sent to Rome for the pall, the archbishop being unable to undertake the journey on account of illness. Pope Paschal treated the canons of Canterbury with marked contempt, and took no notice of them. Anselm, a nephew of the archbishop, who had been much in England, and was living at the papal court, then took their case in hand, and induced the Pope to send the pall by him. At the same time the Pope wrote an angry letter complaining that the See of Rome was treated by the English Church and king with scant reverence. No appeals came from England, no questions were referred to Rome for decision. The English Church presumed to act independently. He trusted this

[1] "As a practical man he failed, and faults in his character were educed of which he was not himself conscious, and to the existence of which his admirers were equally blind. It was requisite for him not only to maintain, but according to circumstances to modify his principles." —Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops*, ii. 266.

[2] *Hist. Nov.*, p. 110.

[3] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pontif.*, p. 125.

would be rectified by the agency of Anselm, whom he had sent to negotiate matters.[1] The pall brought by Anselm was received with all devotion by the new archbishop, and the king summoned a general council of prelates and nobles to meet at Winchester (September 15, 1114). At this assembly Anselm produced a long letter from the Pope, reprehending in severe terms the independent proceedings of the king of England, his presuming to hold councils without the papal authority, his ordering the translation of bishops, and other enormities. It was determined by the council to send messengers to Rome to explain to the Pope the position of the English Church, and William Warelwast, bishop of Exeter, though now blind, was selected for the purpose, as being the most familiar with the papal court.[2]

6. Anselm also returned to Rome, and in the following summer (1115), the king being in Normandy, he came to him, bringing a commission from the Pope to act as Legate in England. This was a new and unheard-of claim. It was something quite different from receiving legates for special purposes and with a defined object. The establishment of a permanent Legate in England had never been tolerated. When the attempt became known in England there was a general excitement; bishops, abbots, and nobles met at London, and it was determined to despatch the Archbishop of Canterbury at once to the king and the Pope. He found the king at Rouen, and Anselm with him. The effect of his interview with Henry was that the papal Legate was forbidden to enter the country.[3] From the visit to the Pope no special results followed; the archbishop was not able to procure a personal interview, he merely obtained a letter from Paschal to the king, saying that he did not desire in any way to interfere with the privileges of the See of Canterbury.[4]

[1] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, p. 112. [2] *Ib.*, p. 116.

[3] *Ib.*, p. 118; Willelm. Malm., *De Gest. Pontif.*, p. 128. He was stopped on the ground that it was the ancient privilege of the Archbishops of Canterbury to be legates of the Pope. This is not to be interpreted as though the archbishops were actually appointed legates as yet, but that by their office and connection with Rome, they were the proper persons to act for the Pope.

[4] Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pontif.* p. 129.

7. The independent attitude assumed by the Church of England was now causing decided uneasiness at Rome. This ill feeling was further aggravated by the circumstances connected with the dispute between Thurstan, Archbishop-elect of York, and Ralph, Archbishop of Canterbury, a dispute which had a very important effect on the after history of the Church of England. Thurstan, being elected to York, applied for consecration to Archbishop Ralph. The Archbishop of Canterbury required the customary oath of obedience. Thurstan objected. An appeal was made to the king, who upheld the Archbishop of Canterbury's claim. Upon this, Thurstan renounced his election, but being over-persuaded by his friends, adopted it again, and applied to the king to accept him. He also invited the interposition of the Pope; and going to Rome, obtained a letter from Pope Paschal to the king, recommending his consecration, and offering to settle any disputes between the two primacies afterwards. Archbishop Ralph, however, was firm in refusing to consecrate, and the king supported him. At this time Calixtus II., a Frenchman, became Pope after a disputed election. He held a Synod at Rheims, to which Thurstan went. The king had exacted a promise from the new Pope that he would do nothing prejudicial to the See of Canterbury, and had warned the Pope not to consecrate Thurstan. Calixtus had replied that he would do nothing to lower the dignity of the See of Canterbury. Nevertheless, on the day before the synod met, the Pope consecrated Thurstan in spite of the protests of the archdeacon of Canterbury. Not only did he consecrate him, but he conferred upon him, so far as in him lay, the privilege of not being subject to the See of Canterbury (Oct. 19, 1119). King Henry was so indignant at this trickery, that he prohibited Thurstan from residing in any part of his dominions.[1] The ultimate effect of Thurstan's action was that henceforth "the assembling of national councils became almost a matter of impossibility;

[1] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, pp. 117-124; Willelm. Malmesb., *De Gest. Pontif*, 262-266. In the following year, however, Henry relaxed this sentence on the threat of the Pope to excommunicate him and suspend the Archbishop of Canterbury; and Thurstan returned to his See.

the disputes, amounting often to undignified personal altercations between the archbishops themselves, disturbed the harmony of even the royal courts and national parliaments."[1]

8. Pope Calixtus having thus shown himself utterly careless of the wishes of the king of England, could hardly expect that so much deference would be shown to him as for the old custom of the land, which prohibited a papal Legate from establishing himself in England, to be abrogated in his favour. Yet, when he had become settled in the papacy, and put down his rival, he attempted this. In order to impress the king and the people of England, he selected as his Legate, Peter, son of a very famous Peter, Prince of the Romans. Great reports were circulated of the grandeur and talent of the coming envoy. The king sent a bishop and a clerk to meet him abroad, and accorded him his permission to enter England, though he had not the least intention of allowing him to stay, or, in fact, to do any act as Legate in the land.[2] Peter arrived, and desired license to act as Legate. The king alleged the fact that he had much business on his hands; that before the claim of the Pope to have a Legate in England could be allowed, there must be a general meeting of the prelates and barons of the land to consider the point; that it was one of the ancient privileges of England that the kingdom should be free from all domination of a Legate, and that this ancient right he would never abandon willingly. Impressing this upon Peter with abundance of civil words, he, in fact, bowed him out of England.[3] Sojourning at Canterbury on his way back, Peter received strong representations from the monks as to the way in which Canterbury had been treated in the matter of Thurstan, and was brought, himself to acknowledge that the primatial church had been badly used, and that he would do what he could

[1] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, ii. 198.

[2] His conductors were especially charged not to allow the proposed Legate to lodge in any monastery, but to bring him straight to the king.

[3] "Immunis ab omni officio, cum ingenti pompâ, viâ quâ venerat extra Angliam missus est."—Eadmer.

to remedy the injustice done. The independence of the English Church was thus carefully guarded by the action of a wise and vigorous king, acting under the advice of a primate of no narrow views. The death of Archbishop Ralph followed soon after the episode of the would-be Legate Peter.[1] In him the Church of England lost a wise, far-seeing, and liberal-minded prelate, and one who well understood the due position of the English Church, and the nature of the unjust encroachments attempted by Rome.

9. The prelate who succeeded Ralph in the chair of Augustine was, unfortunately, a person of a different character from his predecessor. He owed his election, principally, to the fact that he belonged to an order which occupied a sort of middle position between the regulars and the seculars,—that, namely, of Canons Regular. For when, at the council held at Gloucester on the Feast of the Purification (1123), the question of appointing a prelate to the See of Canterbury was discussed, great differences manifested themselves. The monks of Canterbury presented the names of certain persons of the monkish order whom they had selected. But the bishops, who were all seculars, said they would not have a monk to rule over them. The monks replied that from the time of Augustine the See of Canterbury had been always occupied by monks. The king, however, favoured the clerical party, and the names of four clerks were submitted to the deputation from the Canterbury convent, that they might select one from them. Their choice fell upon William of Corbeil, who had been a clerk of the notorious Ralph Flambard, bishop of Durham, but afterwards, "with the object of

[1] Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, pp. 137, 138, 141. We here take leave of Eadmer as a guide, who had so faithfully depicted the lives of Anselm and Ralph. He had been selected by Alexander, king of Scotland, for the bishopric of St. Andrews, but refused to be consecrated without taking the oath of obedience to the See of Canterbury, to which the king of Scotland would not consent. Archbishop Ralph is also the last of the primates in William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Pontificum*. He gives the highest character of him, concluding, "de quo quicquam sinistrum suspicari contra religionem est niti."

bettering his life," had been transferred to the priory of the canons regular of Chiche in Essex. He thus might be regarded as uniting the two characters of secular and regular. When his election had been confirmed, Archbishop Thurstan kindly offered to consecrate him, but his offer was declined unless he would declare that he consecrated him as Primate of all England. This Thurstan was by no means prepared to do, and William was consecrated by his suffragans, and immediately afterwards set out to Rome to obtain the pall; Thurstan also going at the same time to keep a careful watch over the newly obtained immunities of York.[1] The king did not fail to send clerks with the archbishop to guard his interests, but either he was badly served, or else Archbishop William and the Pope contrived to enter into a secret compact, for there can be no doubt that now the whole question of the Roman Legate was conceded as far as the archbishop was concerned. He agreed also, that the quarrel between the two primatial Sees, which had been sharply urged by both the archbishops at Rome, should be decided in a council in England, at which Legates of the Pope should preside.[2]

10. Soon after the return of the archbishop, the consent of the king having been obtained, the papal Legate, John, Cardinal of Crema, arrived in England. The reception which he met with from the archbishops, each eager to secure his good will for their side, moves the patriotic indignation of the monk Gervase. "Too pompously, indeed, was he received. He made his progress through England, and everywhere excited extreme indignation. You might see, indeed, a thing before unheard of in the kingdom of England, a clerk, forsooth, who had only reached the grade of the priesthood, taking precedence of archbishops, bishops, abbots, and all the nobles of the land; sitting upon a lofty throne, while they, sitting beneath him, were waiting for his nod. On Easter Day, at his first coming into England, he celebrated the office of the day in the mother Church in the place of the chief pontiff, presiding on an elevated seat, and using the pontifical insignia,

[1] Simeon Dunelm., *Hist.*, pp. 247-248 (ed. Twysden).

[2] Simeon Dunelm., p. 250.

although not a bishop, but simply a priest. The minds of many were gravely scandalised, for they saw in this both an unusual novelty and the destruction of the ancient liberties of the kingdom of England. For it is a thing most well known to the kingdom of England, and to all the regions lying round about, that from the days of Augustine, the first Metropolitan of Canterbury, up to the time of that William, all the successors of Augustine who were monks had been held primates and patriarchs, and had never been placed under the dominion of any Roman Legate."[1] Political reasons were for the moment all-powerful with the king, and induced him to treat this Legate in a different manner from that which had been used towards those who had before attempted to exercise the Roman authority here.[2] He was allowed to move freely about the country. He went to Scotland to settle a dispute between the Scots and Archbishop Thurstan, and on September 9 (1125), he presided, much to the disgust of both clergy and laity of the English Church, in a great council at Westminster.[3]

11. The canons enacted at this council were as follows: (1.) We, following the ancient fathers, forbid by apostolical authority any man to be ordained for money. (2.) We charge that no price be demanded for chrism-oil, baptism, visiting or anointing the sick, for the communion of the body of Christ, or for burial. (3.) That at the consecrating of bishops, blessing of abbots, dedicating of churches, neither the cope, the carpet, the towel, nor the basin,—nothing in fact at all,—be demanded violently, nor taken except willingly offered. (4.) That no monk or clergyman accept a church, tithe, or any ecclesiastical benefice at the hand of a layman, without the bishop's consent; that every such donation be null, and the offender liable to canonical punishment. (5.) That no one challenge a church or prebend by inheritance from his father, or appoint his own successor to an ecclesiastical benefice. (6.) That clergymen who have churches or benefices be

[1] Gervas., *Act. Pont. Cant.*, p. 1663 (ed. Twysden).

[2] For these, see Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops*, ii. 308.

[3] Contin. Flor. Wigorn., ii. 81.

deprived of them if they refuse to be ordained though their bishops invite them to it, that they may live more at liberty.[1] (7.) Let none be promoted to a deanery or priory but a priest; none to an archdeaconry but a deacon. (8.) Let none be ordained priest or deacon, but to some certain title; if he be, let him not enjoy the honour of his order. (9.) Let no abbot, clergyman, or layman eject any one from a church to which he has been ordained by the bishop, without the bishop's sentence, under pain of excommunication. (10.) Let no bishop ordain or judge one of another diocese; for no man is bound by a sentence passed by an improper judge. (11.) Let no one receive to communion him that is excommunicated by another; if any one do this, let him be deprived of Christian communion. (12.) Let no one person have two archdeaconries, or two honours of a different grade. (13.) By apostolical authority we forbid to priests, deacons, subdeacons, and canons, intercourse with concubines, or to live with any woman except mother, sister, aunt, or such women concerning whom no suspicion could arise. Whosoever shall violate this decree, upon confession and conviction, must suffer the loss of his order.[2] (14.) We forbid usury and base gain of every sort to clerks. Let the offender, upon confession and conviction, be degraded. (15.) Those who practise sorcery—soothsayers and fortune-tellers, and those who support them—we doom to excommunication and perpetual infamy. (16.) We forbid those that are related within the seventh degree to be married; if any such are married, let them be separated.

[1] Mr. Johnson says that this means proceeding from minor orders to the diaconate or priesthood. But there is no question that actual laymen held benefices, employing vicars for the service. This grievance continued long, and will appear again in the time of Grossteste.

[2] A strange comment on this promulgation of the Legate is mentioned by Henry of Huntingdon, who says of him :—"Cum in concilio severissimè de uxoribus sacerdotum tractasset, dicens summum scelus esse a latere meretricis ad corpus Christi conficiendum surgere, cum eadem die corpus Christi confecisset, cum meretrice post vesperam interceptus est. Res apertissima Londoniæ gesta negari non potuit. Summus honor prius ubique habitus in summum dedecus versus est."

(17.) We forbid the refusal of regard to husbands and the witnesses they produce, when they charge their wives with consanguinity—let the ancient authority of the Fathers be preserved.[1]

12. In this Synod nothing was done towards settling the vexed question between York and Canterbury, which had been the ostensible reason for the mission of the Legate into England. It has always been the policy of Rome to keep questions of dispute unsettled and open, that thus a more complete dependence upon itself may be maintained. The Legate and the two Primates left England for Rome soon after the Council. It was promised that the relations of the two Sees should be settled by the Pope himself. And now the policy of the Roman Pontiff invented a method by which the desire for precedence and authority cherished by the prelate of Canterbury might be satisfied, and at the same time the ambition of the Roman See to govern all the churches might be gratified. The method by which he proposed to make the See of Canterbury dominant over that of York, was to make the archbishop of the former the Legate of the Roman Pontiff. This Archbishop William weakly and shamefully accepted, and thus gratified his own personal ambition at the expense of the dignity and independence of his Church.[2] The Primate of all England, *alterius orbis papa*, the patriarch to whom the bishops of the British Church of Wales, the Irish Church, and the Scotch Church, now looked for consecration, was henceforth to govern his province in the name and by the authority of the Pope. It has been well said of this transaction, that "the Archbishops of Canterbury were by this means stripped of their rights, and clothed with the shadow of them. It is here that we are

[1] Contin. Flor. Wigorn., ii. 8; Simeon Dunelm., p. 253; Johnson, *Eng. Canons*, ii. 34-37.

[2] The Bull of Honorius may be found in Wilkins, i. 409. Dr. Hook endeavours to apologise for William; but he forgets that William's predecessor, as well as the king, had successfully resisted the Pope's claim. Professor Stubbs says that the king was acting in concert with the Primate in obtaining the legateship. Of course, if there was to be a legate, it was better for the king that it should be one of his own bishops than a foreigner.—See Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 375.

to date the vassalage of the English Church."[1] The legatine authority of the archbishop was to extend to Scotland as well as to England, and by virtue of it he had the poor satisfaction of repulsing the Archbishop of York, at the ceremony of placing the royal crown on the head of Henry, at Windsor (Christmas 1126), and causing him to lower his cross.[2]

13. At the beginning of the year 1127 the archbishop and all the bishops took the oath of allegiance to Henry's daughter Matilda, an oath which, though solemnly renewed afterwards, was shamefully disregarded by them when the time of trial came. The new Legate of the Pope, anxious to make full proof of his dignity and power, summoned a council at Westminster (May 13, 1127), "by virtue of the power of Peter, prince of the Apostles, and his own." In this council he presided as Legate of the Apostolic See. But his triumph over his rival Thurstan was snatched from him, for the wily Thurstan, "by messages and letters," showed that he was hindered by a reasonable cause from "being present at that assembly."[3] The canons passed by this council were for the most part a repetition of those enacted in 1125. Sorcery was strongly condemned (Canons 1, 2, 3). Deans were to be priests, archdeacons deacons. (4.) Clerical matrimony was again strictly forbidden. Beneficed persons were to be deprived if married; assistant priests to be interdicted from officiating. (5.) Concubines of priests were to be expelled from the parish, unless they were lawfully married there. If they offended again, they were to be sold into slavery.[4] (6.) Archdeacons were not to hold two archdeaconries. (7.) Clergy were not to farm churches. (8.) Tithes were to

[1] Inett, *Ch. Hist.*, ii. 221.

[2] Contin. Flor. Wigorn, ii. 84; Gervas., *Act. Pont. Cant.*, p. 1663. The Chronicler records with evident satisfaction, "Lator Crucis, quam in regis capellam se coram fecit deferri, extra capellam cum cruce ejectus est."

[3] Contin. Flor. Wigorn., ii. 86.

[4] This probably did not apply to the wives, inasmuch as in the former canon, a distinction is drawn between the *conjuges* and the *concubinæ*. It may, however, have included both; as by the canons of 1108, the wife was to be judged an adulteress, and to become the chattel of the bishop. It is unnecessary to point out the iniquity of the provision.

be paid punctually. (9.) No rector was to give away churches or tithes, or to take them without the consent of the bishop.[1] (10.) No abbess or nun was to use more costly garments than lambskins or catskins.[2]

14. The severe canons passed against clerical matrimony in these several councils might be expected to produce speedily considerable effect. But it appears that this was not the case. Priests still lived with their wives, and it is to be feared illicit connections were also very prevalent. So firmly rooted was the custom, that, in accordance probably with the request of the archbishop, the king ordered the assembling of a council in London, in the beginning of August 1129, specially to take counsel about this matter. The chronicler, Henry of Huntingdon, who, as himself the son of a priest, was a strong opponent of the attempt to enforce clerical celibacy, records with somewhat of irony the proceedings of this assembly. "There were many bishops assembled," he says, "the columns of the kingdom, and the bright lights of sanctity. But the king played a trick upon them through the simpleness of Archbishop William. For they gave up into the king's hands the having justice done concerning the wives of the priests, and they were held to have greatly lacked prudence in thus acting by what appeared afterwards, when the matter was terminated in a way which reflected great disgrace upon them. For the king took large sums of money from the priests, and so redeemed them from observing the canons. Then, when it was too late, the bishops were ashamed of their concessions, when everybody saw that they were deceived, while their clergy were heavily burdened." [3]

15. The year 1132 witnessed the foundation of Fountains Abbey, the most famous house of the Cistercian Order.[4] The Cistercian or White Monks had only lately

[1] This refers to the formation of vicarages. In many cases the monastery had become the *persona*, and no arrangement as to what portion of the tithes was to be given for the vicarage was to be made without the bishop, nor was the monastery to receive the tithes of any church without his sanction. [2] Contin. Flor. Wigorn., ii. 86-88.

[3] Hen. Hun., *Histor.*, p. 220 (ed. Saville).

[4] *Ann. de Waverleia, Ann. Monast.*, ii. 223.

obtained a footing in England (1128), but from this time forward they contrived to monopolise all the most liberal gifts of lands and wealth for monastic purposes, and were the most popular form of "religion" in England. The Cistercian Order was due to the zeal of Robert, Alberic, and Stephen, the Englishman who endeavoured, in the eleventh century, to bring about a reform of the prevailing laxity of the Benedictines. They founded a monastery at Citeaux, in Burgundy, in the rule of which manual labour was to have a prominent part, and the strictest asceticism was to be enjoined. The order of the White Monks soon increased rapidly. Within thirty years from its foundation its first abbey was built in England, at Waverley, near Farnham, in Surrey. The popes heaped privileges upon the Cistercians, and granted them complete exemption from episcopal control, and even from the restrictions of an interdict. It was this which was the especial attraction of the order, and all those who were ready to dedicate their goods to the Church were encouraged to choose this channel. The great abbeys of Rievaulx, Tintern, and Fountains, sprang into being soon after that of Waverley. Fountains was founded by a detachment of thirteen monks from St. Mary's, at York, who, hearing of the austerities of the Cistercians, and conscience-smitten for their own laxity, inaugurated an establishment of the new and stricter order under the protection, and with the aid, of Archbishop Thurstan. It soon began to send offshoots to found other abbeys, one of the earliest of which was that of Meaux, and its prosperity was so great, that it became one of the wealthiest and most luxurious abbeys of the land.[1]

16. In the year 1133 another See was given to the English Church. The king founded the bishopric of Carlisle "on the confines of England and Scotland," and placed there as the first bishop, Adulf, the prior of the canons regular of St. Oswald, "to whom he had been accustomed to confess his sins." The bishop naturally determined to form his chapter of the order from which he

[1] Much information will be found about the Cistercians in the Annals of Waverley and of Meaux (Melsa), published in the Roll Series, and the learned prefaces of the editors.

himself had sprung, and accordingly established a body of canons regular at his See.[1] This was among the first of the houses of canons regular established in England.[2] The order did not differ in any essential particular from those of monks. The canons were outwardly marked by wearing a cap and allowing their beards to grow, and their rule had some variations from that of St. Benedict.

17. By the death of Henry I. in 1135 the State lost an able ruler, and the Church a temporal head, who, considering the times in which he lived and the material with which he had to deal, was on the whole favourable to her best interests. But during the latter part of the reign of Henry his ecclesiastical policy underwent a considerable change. The ruler who had so stoutly withstood the claims of Rome when advocated by Anselm, and the attempts to force a Legate upon the country when Ralph was Primate, relaxed his opposition to Rome, allowed the legatine power to be established as an institution of the land, and the rulers of the Church to take their own course. This was greatly due to his desire to obtain the good will of the clergy in support of his daughter's claims to the throne. Twice were the Primate and all the bishops called upon to swear allegiance to Matilda, but the oath was lightly disregarded in the troublous times through which the Church of England was now to pass.

[1] *Ann. de Waverleia*, *Ann. Monast.*, ii. 223.

[2] Not the very first; probably the house of St. Osyth at Chiche, of which Archbishop William was the prior, was the first. The canons regular must not be confounded with the canons secular living under the rule of Chrodegand, several societies of which had been established in England, but without much success. The canons regular professed a rule drawn from the writings of Augustine. Pope Innocent, at the Lateran Council, 1139, decreed that all societies of canons should be bound by this rule. But divers variations from the original Austin Canons afterwards sprang up,—as the Premonstratensian and the Gilbertine. At the time of the Dissolution the Austin Canons possessed 175 houses in England.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A) THE LITERARY WORKS OF ANSELM.

It is not easy to give in a short space an adequate account of the literary works of Anselm. He was a great philosophical and metaphysical writer, as well as a great theologian. His metaphysical works were chiefly composed when he was prior of Bec. It was then he wrote on "Truth," on "the Liberty of the Will," on "the Grammarian," and those more famous treatises, the *Monologium* and the *Proslogium*. The first of these is a dialogue, the great object of which is to identify truth with rectitude, and to connect it with the highest Right, that is, God. It would seem as if Anselm's doctrine pointed towards that held by Erigena and others, *i.e.* the falsity, or, in other words, the non-existence (in a true sense) of evil. The two treatises, *De Voluntate* and *De Libero Arbitrio*, endeavour to establish the theory that the will is perfectly free to choose the right, but not free to choose the wrong, the choice of which implies that the will has been brought into slavery. The dialogue on the "Grammarian" is a rather trivial disquisition as to what the essence of a grammarian is. Is he a substance or a quality? Of a far more important character is the *Monologue*, which is "an attempt to elicit from the necessity of reason, without the aid of Scripture, the idea of God and the real foundation of it, and to exhibit it without the usual employment of learned proofs."—(Church). In the *Proslogium* the argument advanced is that the innate idea of God in the soul is a complete proof of the existence of God (the argument afterwards advanced by Descartes). The most famous theological treatise of Anselm is the *Cur Deus Homo*, a treatise on the Incarnation, which suggests many speculative novelties on the great doctrines of the faith, although, at the same time, it contains much admirable matter on the great subject of which it treats. Anselm also wrote on Predestination, on the Trinity, on the Procession of the Holy Spirit, and many homilies and meditations.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE CHURCH IN TROUBLOUS TIMES.

1135-1154.

1. Relations of Stephen to the Church. 2. Stephen's Charter. 3. His poor performance of his promises. 4. Charges against the bishops of that day. 5. Stephen's treatment of the bishops of Salisbury and Lincoln. 6. The Legate calls a council and summons the king. 7. Stephen resists the council. 8. Civil and Canon law introduced into England. 9. Outrages on religious places and persons. 10. St. William of York. 11. Archbishop Theobald defies the king, and lays the land under an interdict. 12. Leading Churchmen combine for a settlement of affairs.

1. THERE can be no question that the successful seizure by Stephen, Count of Blois, of the crown destined for Matilda was greatly due to the support which he obtained from the Church dignitaries. These, as has been said, had all twice taken the oaths to Matilda, but they lightly disregarded their obligations. The most influential of the bishops at that moment were William, Archbishop of Canterbury, Roger of Salisbury, the Justiciary of the kingdom, and Henry of Winchester. The latter of these was the brother of Stephen, and of course devoted to his interest. It was, according to William of Malmesbury, from the pledges given by him that Stephen would allow perfect liberty to the Church, that the archbishop was induced to crown him at Winchester on St. Stephen's day (1136). Bishop Roger, the Justiciary, had been previously gained, and he, together with Henry of Winchester, assisted at the coronation. There were no other bishops present, no abbots, and but few nobles.[1] In fact, the Church generally was taken by surprise, and knew not what to expect from the new king. At or soon after his coronation, Stephen,

[1] Willelm. Malmesb., *Hist. Nov.*, p. 101 *d* (ed. Saville).

desiring to propitiate the good will of the clergy, promised to allow the canonical election of bishops, and not to prolong vacancies;[1] and during the first year of his reign he issued at Oxford an important charter guaranteeing the liberties of both Church and State.

2. Those parts of this charter which related to the Church ran thus:—"Out of reverence and love of God I agree that holy Church shall be free, and I steadfastly promise to it due respect. I undertake to do nothing, or permit nothing to be done, in the Church or in Church matters, simoniacally. I declare and confirm justice and power over ecclesiastical persons and their goods to belong to the bishops, as well as the distribution of ecclesiastical honours. I decree and allow that the dignities of churches, confirmed by their privileges, and their customs held according to ancient tenure, shall remain inviolate. All the possessions of churches and their tenures, which they held when William the king, my grandfather, was alive, and at his death, I grant to them freely and absolutely, without any right of challenge from opponents. If any of these things held before the death of the said king, but now lost, the Church shall afterwards seek to recover, I reserve for my indulgence and right of dispensing the power either of restoring them or inquiring into the claim. I confirm whatever grants have been made since his death, either by the liberality of kings or the gifts of chief men, whether made by way of offering, or purchase, or by any exchange. I promise that I will act according to peace and justice in all things, and to my power preserve them. The forests which William my grandfather and William my uncle instituted and held I reserve to myself. All the rest which Henry the king superadded I restore and concede, without quit-rent, to the churches and the kingdom. If any bishop or abbot, or other ecclesiastical person, shall before his death have distributed his goods reasonably, I confirm it; if he shall die without having done this, let the distribution be made for the good of his soul according as the Church counsels. While Sees are vacant of their proper pastors, I will commit them and all their possessions to the custody

[1] Hen. Hunt., *Hist.*, f. 221 (ed. Saville).

of clerks or honest men of the same church, until a pastor be canonically supplied."[1]

3. Such were the great promises of the new king. But the chroniclers do not allow us to believe that they were very carefully observed. "He kept none of these things," says Henry of Huntingdon; "he broke his vows to God, and his paction to the people."[2] William of Malmesbury writes the charter, but adds—"The names of the witnesses, who were many, I do not take the trouble to write, for he changed all these things as utterly as though he had only taken the oath to show himself before the whole kingdom as a perjured person. A man he was, indeed, of most mild disposition, but yet I must not hide the truth. Had he not obtained the kingdom unlawfully, and had he not lent his ears to the whispers of malevolent persons in the administration of it, there would have been but little falling short in him of true kingly excellence. Yet under him the treasures of some churches were plundered; estates given away to laymen; the churches of clerks were sold to strangers; bishops were captured or compelled to give up their property; abbacies were granted to unworthy persons, either to please friends or to pay off debts. These things, indeed, were not so much due to himself as to his counsellors, who constantly persuaded him that he need never be in want of money as long as the monasteries were filled with treasures."[3] Another chronicler draws a yet more lamentable picture:—"Every one raises his head against another; discord arises which lays waste all things, both high and low; there is robbery and spoliation everywhere; the strong crushes the weak, stifles his complaints with threats, and hands over to death any one who resists. The great care not how the wretched poor are afflicted—all only think for themselves, provide castles stocked with supplies and garrisoned by armed bands."[4]

4. In these respects the bishops, it is to be feared, were for the most part but little better than the lay barons. A

[1] Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 114.
[2] Hen. Hunt., *Hist.*, ff. 221, 222.
[3] Willelm. Malmesb., *Hist. Nov.*, f. 101 *b* (ed. Saville).
[4] Contin. Flor. Wigorn., ii. 96.

contemporary writer, the author of the *Gesta Regis Stephani*, accuses them of having done no little to aggravate the miseries of the land. He says they were in an abject state of terror, like a reed shaken with the wind, and would not give protection to anybody. They feared to strike with the sword of the Word of God the children of Belial, but in terror at these bold misdoers they either altogether submitted to them or only spoke some mild and trifling sentence against them. Some of them most unepiscopally occupied themselves in furnishing their castles with food and armed retainers, and were more pitiless in plundering their neighbours than any of the freebooting barons. Some of them, girt in armour and mounted on their war-steeds, joined in plundering expeditions, and were ready to inflict prison and torture on their captives to extort money, laying the blame of all not upon themselves but upon their followers. To omit others—for all were not equally to blame —the bishops of Winchester, Lincoln, and Coventry were beyond all others publicly accused of these evil and ungodly practices." [1]

5. Yet though the bishops may have deserved but little of their countrymen, and have been but too ready to follow the bad example of the temporal barons, it is nevertheless certain that the reverence with which their office was regarded had not died out, for nothing created such a storm of unpopularity against King Stephen, and went so near to endanger his throne, as his seizure of the bishops of Salisbury and Lincoln at Oxford, and his compelling them to surrender their castles and their treasures. Roger, bishop of Salisbury, the favourite minister and justiciary of Henry I., had amassed vast treasures, and had expended them in erecting four beautiful castles at Malmesbury, Devizes, Sherborne, and Salisbury. Of his nephews, one (Alexander) had been promoted to the bishopric of Lincoln, another (Nigel) to that of Ely. The former of these had imitated his uncle in castle-building, having erected the

[1] *Gesta Regis Stephani*, p. 96 (Eng. Hist. Soc.) The bishops specially noted were Henry, the king's brother, Alexander of Blois, nephew of the Justiciary, and Roger de Clinton.

castles of Newark, Sleaford, and Banbury,[1] in his diocese. Some of the bad advisers of whom William of Malmesbury speaks, had been frequently suggesting to the king that the wealth and possessions of these magnificent prelates were altogether unbecoming to Churchmen, and ought to be turned to better account. At the council held at Oxford, June 1139, Stephen determined to act upon these suggestions. The bishops of Salisbury and Lincoln were summoned to attend; they went unwillingly, knowing perhaps the mind of the king towards them. They considered it necessary to be attended by a large body of retainers, and a tumult, accidental or intentional, arose between their followers and those of the Count of Brittany. The prelates were summoned before the king; they were charged with levying war, and bid to give up the keys of their castles.[2] They hesitated, and were immediately taken into custody. Nigel, bishop of Ely, who had escaped before the arrest of his relatives, hastened to Devizes to put the castle in a state of defence against the king. Stephen soon appeared before it with the bishops as his prisoners, and with Roger, the Chancellor, the son of the bishop of Salisbury, whom he threatened to hang if the castle were not surrendered. Bishops Roger and Alexander entreated Bishop Nigel to surrender, and declared that they would not taste food until he had done so. For three days the bishop of Ely held out, and his brother and uncle were constrained to fast. Then he surrendered the castle, and the king came into the possession of no less than seven strong places furnished with vast treasures.[3]

6. So violent and grievous an outrage, done to leading Churchmen, excited a vast commotion. Henry, bishop of

[1] He also built four religious houses, viz. Thame, Haverholme, Louth Park, and the house for Austin Canons at Dorchester.

[2] Conveniri jussit episcopos ut curiæ suæ satisfacerent de hoc quod homines eorum pacem ipsius exturbassent; modus satisfactionis fuit ut claves castellorum suorum quasi fidei vades traderent."—Will. Malm., *Hist. Nov.*, p. 102 *b* (ed. Saville).

[3] Willelm. Malmesb., *Hist. Nov.*, f. 103 (ed. Saville); Contin. Flor. Wigorn., ii. 103; Henric. Huntingdon, *Hist.*, f. 223 (ed. Saville); *Gesta Regis Stephani*, 47-51, E. H. S.

Winchester, was the brother of the king, but he was also the Legate of the Pope, and bound to defend the privileges and immunities of Churchmen; and at this moment the bishop of Winchester, who had done so much to help the accession of Stephen, was not very favourably disposed towards the king; for at the death of Archbishop William (November 1, 1136) he had expected to be advanced to the dignity of Primate. Stephen, however, probably fearing that his brother would thus become too powerful, refused to second his views. The bishop of Winchester procured the presence of a papal Legate, Alberic, bishop of Ostia,[1] to aid him with his influence and intrigues in his designs on the primacy; but all his plans were unsuccessful. The king obtained the election, by the Canterbury chapter, of Theobald, abbot of Bec, who was consecrated January 8, 1139. To make up for the disappointment which the bishop of Winchester had experienced, the Pope conferred upon him the office of Legate (1139), and thus constituted him virtually a more influential person than the archbishop. Proud of his new dignity, and anxious to show its power; angry and resentful against the brother who had slighted him, the bishop of Winchester called a council of the prelates in the name of the Pope, and cited King Stephen to appear to answer for his outrage on the bishops of Salisbury and Lincoln.

7. The king appeared by his representatives in answer to the summons, but he was by no means in a yielding mood. He caused his advocates to plead against the bishops that it was utterly against the canons for bishops to possess castles, and that even supposing it was lawful for them to have them, yet, when the king demanded their surrender to him for purposes of State, they ought not to refuse. Stephen also declared that if any attempted to appeal to Rome against him, it would be at their peril. His attitude was so defiant that the Legate and the bishops were cowed. They did not dare to speak the curse of the Church against him, though he had thus violently dealt with ecclesiastical property. They had recourse at length to prayers and

[1] This Alberic held a Legatine Council during this short sojourn in England. See Johnson, *Eng. Canons*, ii. 42.

entreaties that the king would have pity upon the Church and upon his own soul, and not suffer this serious "breach between Church and State" to arise. Stephen appears to have promised little, and to have performed still less.[1]

8. Theobald, who had succeeded to the primacy in spite of the intrigues of Henry of Winchester, introduced some important changes in the matter of Church law. The Conqueror had caused the separation of Church courts from those of the common law, but the law which the Church courts administered was doubtful and uncertain, and there was no regular standard or body of jurisprudence by which their decisions were guided. The twelfth century witnessed the rise in Italy of the study of civil law founded upon the Pandects of Justinian, and in imitation of this code the Church began to compile a code of her own, the most famous form of which was finally due to the labours of Gratian, a Benedictine monk.[2] This law Archbishop Theobald determined to introduce into England.[3] He sent one of his clerks, Thomas Becket, afterwards so famous in history, to study the new science at Bologna, and when, at the death of Pope Innocent II. (1143), the legatine commission granted to Henry of Winchester expired, and Theobald obtained the appointment of Roman Legate, he was able to carry out his purpose.[4] From the time of its appearance, about 1151, the compilation of Gratian, known as the *Decretum*, was the text-book of the English Church courts.[5] The Archbishop of Canterbury was from the time of Theobald held to have a prescriptive right to the character of Roman Legate, and was styled *Legatus natus*, but his authority might

[1] Willelm. Malmesb., *Hist. Nov.*, pp. 103 *b*, 104 *a* (ed. Saville).

[2] "Burchard of Worms, Ivo of Chartres, and after them Gratian supplied manuals of the new jurisprudence."—Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, ii. 171.

[3] Gervase says of him, "Cum esset naturâ simplex et aliquantulum literatus, ascivit clericos scholares quorum consilio suo impetu quolibet ducebatur."—*Chron.*, p. 1312 (ed. Twysden).

[4] "Tunc leges et causidici in Angliam primo vocati sunt, quorum primus erat magister Vacarius. Hic in Oxonefordiâ legem docuit."—Gervas., *Act. Pont. Cant.*, p. 1665.

[5] Gratian's *Decretum* contained the false decretals of Isidore, and hence was by no means a trustworthy guide for papal decisions.

at any time be superseded by the mission of a Legate direct from Rome called *Legatus a Latere*, so that the appointment, though it might give him temporary precedence over his rival the Archbishop of York, did not really confer upon him either dignity or power, while it altogether destroyed his independent attitude towards the See of Rome.

9. The troubles of the evil days of Stephen had one especially marked feature, that the reverence for holy places and the rights of sanctuary were almost entirely cast away. The chronicler tells us that the buildings erected by pious founders for the service of God were now violently seized and turned into freebooters' castles. Thus one Geoffrey expelled the monks of Ramsey, and used the monastery as his castle. Count William of York treated in the same way the monastery of St. Mary at Bridlington, and Alan, Count of Richmond, violently entered and seized the church of Ripon.[1] Everywhere throughout England men were striving to get castles, each of them, says William of Malmesbury, defending, or I should rather say wasting, its own district. Into these robbers' holds armed men drove away from the fields herds and flocks, and spared neither churches nor cemeteries in their plunder. When the houses of the wretched peasants had been utterly spoiled, they then threw themselves into dungeons, nor did they let them go till they had exhausted all that they had, and all that in any way they could procure. Many perished in the tortures used upon them. The Legate, with the bishops, again and again excommunicated all violators of cemeteries and churches, and those who laid hands upon men of religious orders or their dependants, but their anathemas were scarce of any avail. Such was the utterly miserable state of the land that not even bishops or monks could go from one town to another in safety.[2] Yet though the reverence for holy places and things would seem to have almost departed, at no time did the building of monasteries go on more rapidly, due mainly, no doubt, to the zeal stirred up by the new Cistercian Order. Ford and Meaux, Thame, Boxley, and

[1] Johann. Hagustald. (Twysden), p. 273.

[2] Willelm. Malmesb., *Hist. Nov.*, p. 105 *a* (ed. Saville).

Woburn, Bruerne, Combe, and many other religious houses, owe their origin to this period.

10. Amidst the grievous complaints against secular and martial prelates, some of them said to be even more fierce and cruel than secular barons, it is pleasant to turn to one at least of another temper, and to contemplate in St. William of York a gentle and holy man who adorned the religion of Christ. The only fault of William appears to have been that he was a nephew of the king, and was thus pressed, perhaps somewhat strongly, on the chapter of York by royal influence. This seems to be the only excuse for the opposition which arose against him at York, which was propagated to Rome, and upheld by all the influence of the great St. Bernard. William was a canon of York and treasurer of the church, and at the death of Thurstan was, after a considerable delay, for his conspicuous merits, elected by a majority of the canons to the archiepiscopal throne. "He was a man," says Thomas Stubbs, "of noble race, and incomparably distinguished by the excellence of his morals and his most pure life. But Osbert the archdeacon (who perhaps desired the post for himself), urged on by envy, contrived to stir up a quarrel among the electors, and pertinaciously hindered the confirmation of the election, although by all men William was held to be worthy. The business was therefore suspended, and the parties to the election summoned to Rome, and there, through the false accusations of his adversaries,[1] William could not obtain the grace of consecration. For five years the process ran on, and at length nothing seemed to remain to cause further delay. But Eugenius, a Cistercian monk, had succeeded to the Papacy, and he, on no ground of personal unfitness, but simply because he chose to do so, declared the election void." Henry Murdak, a monk of his own order, was consecrated, and for the period of his episcopate William waited quietly and meekly.[2] On the

[1] The sum of their charge, says John of Hexham, was that William, Earl of York, declared at the synod that it was the wish of the king that William should be elected.—Johann. Hagustald., p. 272 (ed. Twysden).

[2] He retired to Sicily and lived with his friend Robert, the Chan-

death of Murdak (1153), William was again elected, and now another pope had succeeded the Cistercian pupil of St. Bernard, who condemned his predecessor's acts, and at once consecrated William and invested him with the pall. William returned into England, everywhere reverenced for the purity and holiness of his life. He took possession of his See with all solemnity, displaying (as it was thought) both the power of working miracles and the gift of prophecy; but within thirty days of his arrival at York he died, to the universal regret of his people.[1] The episode of his life is chiefly remarkable in showing how a faultless man, canonically chosen bishop, could yet be unfairly kept back from his office by the intrigues of Rome, the inordinate jealousy of secular influence, and finally, by that blind devotion to the interests of a particular order, which, even in St. Bernard, seems to have overpowered all other considerations.[2]

11. The Archbishop of Canterbury, as the bitter foe of Henry of Winchester, was opposed to the claims of William, and nothing perhaps more illustrates the anarchy of the period than the part which Archbishop Theobald was able at this time to play towards the king and the country. Pope Eugenius had called a council at Rheims, to which all the English bishops were summoned. King Stephen, feeling not unnaturally some resentment against the Papacy on account of the unfair treatment to which his nephew St. William had been subjected, and mindful, it may be, of the ancient traditions of the freedom of the English Church, forbade the bishops to attend.[3] But the

cellor of King Roger, who was by birth an Englishman. (Johann. Hagustald., *l. c.*) Afterwards, according to Brompton, he lived on a manor belonging to the bishop of Winchester.—Brompton, p. 1041 (ed. Twysden).

[1] He is said, in Roger de Hoveden's Chronicle, to have been poisoned at the ablutions after the Eucharist (i. 213, Rolls ed.)

[2] Stubbs, *Act. Pontif. Ebor.* (Twysden), p. 1721; Johann. Hagustald., p. 268, *sq.* (ed. Twysden); Brompton, p. 1041 (ed. Twysden); *S. Bernardi Epp.* ccxxxviii. ccxxxix.

[3] This is said by Gervase to have been done at the instigation of Henry of Winchester, out of spite against the archbishop.—*Chronica Gervas.*, 1363 (ed. Twysden).

archbishop, a Roman Legate, and feeling more bound to Rome than to England, determined at all costs to disobey the prohibition, and to present himself at the council. As all the ports were carefully watched, so that no vessel could sail from them, he trusted himself to a broken boat, and with great danger and difficulty reached the shores of France. The Pope received him with the greatest joy and honour, and declared before the whole council, that the reverence of the Archbishop of Canterbury was so great for St. Peter and the Roman Court, that he had reached them rather by swimming than by sailing. It was before this council that the case of St. William was brought. It was declared by some of the clerks of York that William had not been canonically elected, but had been forced upon them by the king's nomination. His deposition was decreed, without, as it seems, any hearing of the opposite side, simply on the ground that the king had interfered with the election. As King Stephen's nominee, William would scarce be likely to obtain much consideration, and there by the side of the York clerks, and as one probably to succeed to his place, stood Henry Murdak, abbot of Fountains, a grand foundation of the order to which the Pope himself belonged.[1] On his return from the council, Archbishop Theobald was honourably received at Canterbury, but the king, full of wrath at the open contumacy exhibited by the archbishop, hastened to that city, and after severely upbraiding him, inflicted on him the sentence of banishment. Theobald retired to France, where at St. Omer's he exercised his office as much as he could,[2] and carried on a correspondence with the king. Stephen showing no disposition to yield, Archbishop Theobald had the audacity to lay the whole land under an interdict. After this he ventured to return to England, and, strong

[1] Henry Murdak did succeed, as has been stated. But it is observable that at the election which took place after William's deposition, Hilary, bishop of Chichester, obtained the majority of votes, and was unfairly passed over by the Pope in favour of the Cistercian abbot. Gervas, *Chron.*, p. 1363.

[2] He consecrated at this time Gilbert, bishop of Hereford, two foreign bishops assisting him.

in the support of the Pope, to make his interdict still more pressing. At Framlingham in Norfolk he received a deputation of the bishops of London, Chichester, and Norwich, accompanied by many nobles, beseeching him to relax the interdict. The central authority was so powerless, that the archbishop, though within the territories of Stephen, seems to have acted like an independent prince, and to have treated almost on equal terms with the king. At length it pleased him to withdraw the curse which he had inflicted upon his province on account of his own supposed personal grievances, and he and the king were reconciled.[1]

12. The weariness felt by all men in the country of the state of anarchy and misery in which England had been so long kept, was still more oppressive, doubtless, to the rulers of the Church than to secular men. The work of the Church could not go on during such a chaos. Men freely said that Christ slept. Excommunication had lost its power. Men were all accursed and forsworn and abandoned.[2] The miseries of the time were sufficient at length to draw together enemies and rivals so pronounced as the Archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of Winchester. Forgetting their mutual grudge as to the legateship, these two influential prelates co-operated with the other nobles of the land in making the settlement which resulted in continuing the regal power to Stephen for his life, and after his death conferring it on the young Henry Fitz-Empress. On the death of Stephen (1154), the archbishop conducted a regency as head of the Council of State, and managed affairs with prudence and success. The young king came to England, well disposed to the Primate, and his regard for him led him to appoint as his Chancellor, Thomas, his archdeacon, who had long been the principal adviser and director of the archbishop's policy.

[1] *Chron. Gervasii*, pp. 1363-4 (ed. Twysden). [2] A.-S. Chron.

CHAPTER XV.

THE GREAT CONFLICT BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.

1154-1170.

1. Importance of the reign of Stephen. 2. Thomas Becket as Chancellor. 3. His reasons for shrinking from the primacy. 4. Election and consecration of Becket. 5. First coldness between Becket and the king. 6. Other causes of estrangement. 7. The dispute at Westminster on the "ancient customs." 8. Becket promises to observe the "ancient customs." 9. The Council of Clarendon; Becket draws back from his promise. 10. He is induced to yield and to swear to the "Constitutions." 11. Becket attempts to escape to the Pope, but is brought back. 12. The Council of Northampton; Becket's escape. 13. Henry's envoys and Becket before the Pope at Sens. 14. Henry's vengeance on the archbishop's friends. 15. Becket at Pontigny; his excommunications at Vezelai. 16. Becket at Sens; his return to England. 17. The letters against the bishops; Henry's fury. 18. The murder of Becket. 19. Horror at the crime. 20. Effects of Becket's murder.

1. THE reign of Stephen is important politically, as "exemplifying the working of causes and principles which had no other opportunity of exhibiting their real tendencies."[1] It showed, in fact, that feudalism meant anarchy. And it is important ecclesiastically, because, during its commotions, and through the weakness of the secular governing power, the Church made rapid advances in its claims for authority as a rival of the State. Thus the way was prepared for the great conflict which was fought out in the next reign. It is remarkable that during the earlier years of Henry II., the same person kept the advancing claims of the Church within bounds, who afterwards, when he himself became responsible for them, contended most zealously for their fullest development.

2. Thomas, archdeacon of Canterbury,[2] was appointed

[1] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 335.

[2] For the early life of Thomas Becket, see Notes and Illustrations

by the king his Chancellor, on the strong recommendation of Archbishop Theobald.[1] The archbishop had had plentiful experience of the zeal and capacity of the archdeacon, and he could not have recommended to the king a minister more capable of carrying out the reforms so urgently needed in England after the lawlessness of the reign of Stephen. The great glory of Henry II.'s reign was the inauguration of the rule of law—not depending, as in the Conqueror's time, on the personal administration of the sovereign, but administered by fixed courts and regular judges. In this all-important matter Becket zealously aided the king. He himself sat as a judge, which previous Chancellors had not done. He was "the Chancellor, lawyer, judge, financier, captain, and Secretary of State."[2] By the vigorous policy in which he bore a prominent part, during the early days of Henry II., the mercenaries were dismissed, the castles of the robber barons razed to the ground, the Crown recovered its demesne lands, fixed payments were established in lieu of military service, malefactors were punished, the debased coinage improved. There remained but one great class of reforms to be entered upon, viz. the reform of the morals of the clergy. Henry doubtless believed that in this too his Chancellor would furnish him the most efficient aid. He had never as yet shown himself specially eager to defend the liberties of the Church. He had defended the king's claims, as against the bishop, in the matter of Battle Abbey. He had acquiesced in the clergy being made liable for scutage. He was generally regarded

to this Chapter. Probably the life of Becket has been more written of and commented on than that of any other Churchman. Dr. Giles has collected seven contemporary lives, all written by men well cognisant of the circumstances—viz. an anonymous *Vita S. Thomæ*, Lives by Roger de Pontigny, William Fitz-Stephen, John of Salisbury, William of Canterbury, Lambethiensis, and Herbert de Bosham. To say nothing of the earlier chroniclers and later historians, this life has been investigated with great care by Canon Robertson, Dean Stanley, Dean Milman, and Dean Hook. There is probably no better authority for the events of it than Ralph de Diceto, who was well known both to Becket and his great opponent Foliot, and the partisan of neither.

[1] Roger de Hoveden, i. 215. [2] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 461.

by the clergy as a persecutor and enemy of the Church.[1] The king, therefore, thought that he could not have a more efficient instrument in bringing the clergy to something like order and decency, than this able and vigorous minister; and in order to increase his efficiency and power, he determined, on the death of Theobald (April 1161), to make Thomas Becket Archbishop of Canterbury.

3. It was no mere ordinary *Nolo Episcopari* which made Becket deprecate the honour attempted to be thrust upon him.[2] He knew himself to be one who could not perform what he held to be the duties of any post which he accepted, slackly. He was well aware also of the king's mind and intention with regard to the clergy. His view of moral obligation being as it seems entirely positive, and not founded on any deeper principle, he was conscious that what he had upheld when chancellor, he must violently oppose when archbishop. He was contented, therefore, to continue the secular "persecutor," believing that his duty to the king excused and required this of him, rather than become the responsible and high-placed Churchman, when, in his view, the obligations upon him would become changed, and the Church would now demand of him that which before she had not claimed, viz. an entire opposition to the king's will. This singular view of duty Thomas did not fail to impress upon the king during the thirteen months which elapsed between the death of Theobald and his election to the primacy. As, however, it is in itself somewhat difficult of apprehension, and as Henry had had ample proof of the ready service of his minister, it is scarcely to be wondered at, that the king did not believe in it, and that, in spite of warnings and protests honestly put forth by Thomas, he insisted, with his resolute will, in forcing him to accept the post of Primate.

4. The long delay between the appointment of Becket to the primacy and his consecration was due to the opposition manifested on the part of Churchmen to the appointment. The Canterbury monks did not discern, any more than the king, the future line of policy of the archbishop-

[1] See Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops*, ii. 382.

[2] Gervas, *Act. Pont. Cant.*, p. 1669 (ed. Twysden).

designate, and they were unwilling to elect to the highest post in the Church one whom they had only hitherto known as a strong repressor of ecclesiastical pretensions.[1] The suffragan bishops would be equally apprehensive of accepting such an one to rule over them, and it is said that not until the arrival of the great Justiciary Richard de Luci, with the king's peremptory commands and menaces, could the election be brought about.[2] Becket had been previously despatched to England, the king being still abroad, and in May 1162, at a large assembly at Westminster, in the presence of Prince Henry and the Justiciary, the prior and monks of Canterbury elected Thomas as archbishop, and the suffragan bishops accepted him, Foliot, bishop of Hereford, alone protesting.[3] The archbishop-elect returned to Canterbury to be consecrated. He was only in deacon's orders, and on the Saturday before Whitsunday he was raised to the priesthood by Walter, bishop of Rochester. It was intended that his consecration should take place the next day, the great festival of Whitsunday, but a dispute arose as to who was to be the chief consecrator. The Archbishop of York claimed the honour, and it was conceded that it ought to belong to him, if only he would restore to Canterbury the allegiance which had been taken away by Thurstan. This, however, he refused to do. Then a Welsh bishop claimed it as being the senior, by consecration, of all the bishops then present. Walter of Rochester also claimed it as chaplain of the archiepiscopal See. It was at length agreed that (the See of London being vacant) Henry of Winchester was the fitting person, as he was precentor of the church of Canterbury, and by the position of his See and his own royal blood, the foremost of the suffragans of Canterbury. By him, therefore, the ceremony was performed on the octave of Whitsunday, June 1162, thirteen bishops of the province assisting.[4]

[1] Grim, *Vita S. Thomæ* (Giles), i. 14 ; R. de Pontigny (Giles), i. 104.

[2] See the letter of Gilbert Foliot, printed by Dr. Giles. On the authenticity of this letter, which has been disputed, see Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, iii. 454, note.

[3] Grim, *Vita S. Thomæ* (Giles), i. 15 ; R. de Pontigny (Giles), i. 107.

[4] *Chronica Gervasii*, pp. 1382-3 (ed. Twysden). The first act of the

5. It is said on good authority that one principal reason why the king was so eagerly bent on having Thomas as archbishop, was that he desired to have an archbishop for his Chancellor. Proportionately, therefore, was he disappointed when, almost as the first act of the archbishop, a messenger was sent to him in Normandy, bearing the resignation by Becket of the post of Chancellor, and restoring the seal. Henry had calculated that, with the highest dignitary of the Church acting as his Chancellor, and ready to append his seal to that of the king, matters both in Church and State would proceed easily. But this hope was at once dispelled by the action of the archbishop. When Henry then returned to England, at Christmastide, he met the archbishop coldly. The relations between them were already changed.[1] Henry's reply to the cession of the chancellorship was a demand that the archbishop should resign the rich post of archdeacon of Canterbury, which, at the king's desire, he had continued to hold to reimburse him for the expense of entering upon his See. Possibly it may have been with the intention of further signifying his annoyance with Becket, that at this time Gilbert Foliot, bishop of Hereford, the only bishop who had ventured to express aloud his dislike of Becket's advancement, was translated to the See of London.[2]

6. When the relations between him and the king were thus strained, Becket went to attend the council summoned to meet at Tours by the Pope. He was attended by all his suffragans except three, who were excused on account of illness. His state and retinue were magnificent, and he was treated with marked honour by the Pope, being seated on his right hand. The temper prevalent in the council, and the discourses delivered there, were all unfavourable to the claims of the secular authority; and

new archbishop was to raise the day of his consecration to the dignity of a high festival in honour of the holy and undivided Trinity.

[1] Radulph de Diceto, i. 307-8 (Rolls ed.)

[2] See the letter of Pope Alexander in Diceto :—"Quod idem rex desiderat plurimum et requirit."—R. de Diceto, i. 309. It is also said that Thomas desired his advancement (Gervas, 1384); but this seems doubtful.

Becket returned to England more determined than before to concede nothing to the king. On his return he proceeded at once to make divers claims on the part of the temporal possessions and rights of the See of Canterbury, which may possibly have been founded in justice, but which were somewhat inopportune, and calculated to embitter against him both the king and the barons whose interests were involved.[1] He even ventured, in open contradiction of the law of the Conqueror, to excommunicate a tenant-in-chief of the Crown,[2] without previously certifying the king as to his intentions. Thus then, when the king and the archbishop met at Woodstock, in July 1163, the ground was already prepared for an open quarrel between them. The immediate cause of this quarrel is obscure,[3] but it was connected with some claim made by the king to collect the ancient tax, known as the Danegelt, as direct revenue to the Crown, instead of allowing the sheriffs to collect it, making a profit out of it for themselves, and compounding for it to the Crown. The archbishop flatly refused to allow this tax to be paid as revenue to the Crown. The king swore by the "eyes of God" that it should be paid as revenue. The archbishop as violently replied that not a penny should thus be paid from the lands of the Church. Thus there was an open quarrel between the king and the Primate.[4]

7. The ill-feeling thus developed between Becket and Henry soon came to be connected with a question of principle, and greatly intensified thereby. At this moment the crying grievance in England was the outrageous immorality of the clergy,[5] and the immunity which they enjoyed in

[1] See Gervas, *Chron.*, p. 1384; R. de Diceto, i. 311.

[2] The archbishop gave the living of Eynesford to one Lawrence. William, baron of Eynesford, the patron of the living, drove out Lawrence. The archbishop excommunicated him.—R. de Diceto, i. 312. Possibly this may not have taken place till after the meeting at Woodstock.

[3] See Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 462.

[4] Grim, *Vita S. Thomæ* (Giles), i. 21; R. de Pontigny (Giles), i. 113.

[5] It must be remembered that this term is not to be confined to those in the higher orders, but includes all those who had taken the tonsure, as well as their servants and dependants.

their ill-doings. The long disorders of Stephen's reign had naturally produced a grievous crop of crime and ignorance. This had been in some measure repressed among the laity, but the clerical offenders were still untouched. They had, or claimed to have, a right of being tried only in their own courts and by their own superiors. The effect of this was to bring about an entire failure of justice. William of Newbury, a contemporary annalist, thus writes:—"How many clerks have been deprived of their office in England? The bishops will defend the liberties of the clergy and contend for the dignity of their order, while they are not careful to correct and repress their vices. They think they are performing well their duty to God and the Church if they defend against all public censure those criminous clerks upon whom they themselves either refuse or neglect to inflict canonical censures, as their office ought to make them ready to do. From which cause the clergy called to the Lord's inheritance, and placed as stars in the firmament of heaven, who ought to shine above the earth both in life and word, having impunity to do whatever they please, are led into license and liberty, and throw off all reverence for God, whose judgment seems to tarry, and for rulers, inasmuch as the bishops care not to check them, and the prerogative of their sacred order exempts them from secular jurisdiction."[1] This monster abuse the king determined now, if possible, to remove. Mainly with a view to this he summoned a great council to meet at Westminister in October 1163. It was agreed both by king and archbishop that *after degradation* the secular law courts might deal with one who had been a clerk. The exact point of dispute seems to have been whether these courts could punish the degraded clerk for the offence for which he had been degraded, or only in case he offended again after degradation. It was contended by the Church advocates that the former would be equivalent to punishing a man twice for the same offence; it was replied by the seculars that degradation, even when inflicted, was no adequate punishment for such monstrous crimes as murder, rape, arson, etc.; that the Church courts, which could not sentence to death, had no

[1] Willelm. Neubridg., lib. ii. c. 15.

power to punish such crimes fittingly; and that it was absolutely necessary that the clerk, having been degraded, should then be handed over to the secular court for a further trial.[1] This argument was so evidently reasonable that the bishops assembled at Westminster were quite prepared to accede to the king's demands. They did not in fact amount to any invasion of clerical immunities, inasmuch as the criminated clerk was first to be tried before his bishop, and if found guilty, degraded, and then only to be amenable to the secular discipline. Only the king desired that, to prevent the failure of justice and the escape of the clerk, some of his officers should be present at the degradation. But though the bishops were ready to agree to what the king desired, the Primate was not. Possibly he might have been, had there been no ill-feeling between him and the king. But as it was, the archbishop vehemently declared that to grant what was asked would be to impair the liberty of the Church, and by his earnestness he made the bishops draw back where they had before been inclined to yield. All day long the fierce strife continued. At length the king, whose hot temper must have been grievously tried, put to the bishops this plain question—"Were they willing to observe the ancient customs of the land?" They did not reply at once, but took counsel with the archbishop, and then gave for answer, "That they were willing to observe the known customs of the king and kingdom, but without prejudice to their order and the right of the Church." The king, indignant at this answer, which in fact meant nothing, swore with his usual profane oath that he would have those words, "without prejudice to their order," away. The bishops remained silent. Only Hilary of Chichester, a vain and empty man, thought he could mend matters by substituting for *salvo ordine, bonâ fide*. The king, who was too angry to consider the force of terms, would have an answer to what he had asked, Yes or No, without any conditions; and when the bishops would not say Yes unconditionally, he went away in his wrath.[2]

[1] See Radulph de Diceto, i. 313.

[2] Gervas. Dorobern. *Chron.* 1384-5; Roger de Hoveden, i. 219-220.

8. As the king's wrath cooled down, and as he reflected on the importance of the matter at stake, he determined to try upon Becket the effect of a conciliatory appeal. This was done at Northampton, but the archbishop showed himself in nowise inclined to yield; he rather took the line of lecturing Henry for his attempt to intrude upon the sacred ground of the Church. The effect, therefore, was an increased hostility between them.[1] But now Becket, much probably to his surprise and annoyance, found by letters from the Pope and the Cardinals that his cause was not espoused by the heads of the Church which he was so zealous to serve. They counselled submission to the king, whose support was so much needed at Rome. Becket discovered also that some of the bishops who had been with him at Westminster would not support him any longer. He went, therefore, to the king at Woodstock, and promised to observe the ancient customs without any addition of the phrase "without prejudice to my order."[2] Henry's reply was that the avowal must be made publicly, as the refusal had been, and he summoned a council to meet at his manor of Clarendon, near Salisbury, January 25, 1164.

9. At the king's command the archbishops and bishops and a large number of barons assembled. All were called upon to accept the ancient customs of the kingdom. Immediately there arose a question as to what these ancient customs were. The expression was too indefinite to justify an oath taken blindly. There were "immense discussions,"[3] and at length it was determined that two well-skilled persons—namely, Richard de Luci, Grand Justiciary, and Jocelin de Bailleul, a French lawyer, should draw up a codification of the customs. They produced a list of sixteen "constitutions," which were represented to be the ancient and recognised customs of the kings of

[1] The account of this interview is given in Roger de Pontigny (Giles), i. 116.

[2] Roger de Pontigny (Giles), i. 123; Grim (Giles), i. 27. "Ad consentiendum quodammodo coactus est."—Gervas, p. 1385.

[3] Post immensos tractatus.—R. de Diceto.

England.[1] In these Constitutions the ancient custom as to the point specially in dispute between the king and the archbishop is thus set forth:—"Clerks accused of any crime shall be summoned by the king's justice into the king's court, to answer there for whatever it shall be determined they ought to answer there; and in the ecclesiastical court for whatever it shall be determined they ought to answer there; yet so that the king's justice shall send into the court of holy Church to see in what way the matter shall there be handled; and if the clerk shall confess and be convicted, the Church for the future shall not protect him." This is sufficiently vague. It does not actually settle the disputed point as to whether a clerk could be tried twice for the same offence—once in the Church court, and then, if degraded, in the secular court. It does not settle whether a clerk, acquitted in the spiritual court, could be tried in the temporal. Probably the archbishop might have accepted this exposition, and not have been induced by it to draw back from his promise. But when we look at the whole body of the Constitutions, the case is very different. Becket found "that he was required to make concessions which involved the sacrifice of the great principle to which he had devoted his life. Instead of a distinct *imperium*, of which he was to be the head, the Church was to be reduced to its ancient condition under the Anglo-Saxons and the Conqueror, and become merely an *imperium in imperio*."[2] He drew back from his general promise in the face of these particulars. With his principles he could do no less. Better would it have been for his fame had he persisted in his refusal to accept the Constitutions.

10. On the refusal of the archbishop to accept the draft of the Constitutions, the rage of the king, the excitement of the council, knew no bounds. The bishops were now with the Primate. Only two of them besought him to yield.[3] But the barons supported the king. Things looked so threatening that the better among the nobles,

[1] They are printed in Gervas. *Chron.*, p. 1386. They will be found in Mr. Stubbs's translation in Notes and Illustrations to this Chapter.

[2] Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops*, ii. 409.

[3] Jocelin of Salisbury and William of Norwich.

Robert, Earl of Leicester, and Reginald, Earl of Cornwall, earnestly prayed the archbishop to accept the Constitutions. Two of the most famous of the Knights of the Temple, with prayers and tears, urged him to have pity on the clergy, who were placed in imminent danger.[1] Everywhere armed men were rushing through the rooms, brandishing their weapons as if the bishops were to be straightway massacred. Becket at length yielded to the importunity, and promised to observe the Constitutions. He gave permission also for the bishops to observe them.[2] It may be doubtful whether Becket's promise was made *bonâ fide*. Probably he had in view, in making it, the dispensation of the Pope to repudiate it, which he immediately sought. At any rate, when the king required him to put his seal to the Constitutions, he angrily refused. "Never," he said, "should seal of his be put to that writing, nor would he confirm those laws."[3] It seems impossible to reconcile this with a *bonâ fide* promise to accept them.[4] Yet, though he would not seal, he accepted a portion of the MS. of the Constitutions which were written in triplicate,[5] and then hastily left the council, directing his course towards Winchester. The proceedings at Clarendon do not tend to raise the character of Becket, and he is said to have been so angry with himself, that he appointed himself a forty days' penance, and eagerly sought absolution from the Pope.

11. Meantime the king, who had thus triumphed over his opponent, was anxious to secure and extend his victory, and applied also to the Pope to make Roger, Archbishop of York—a strong opponent of Becket's—Legate instead of him. Pope Alexander was greatly perplexed. His sympathies were of course with Becket, but his interests seemed to require the support of Henry. His plan was to grant the legateship to Archbishop Roger as the king de-

[1] Gervas, *Chron.*, p. 1386; Grim, *Vita S. Thomae* (Giles), i. 30; R. de Pontigny (Giles), i. 126.

[2] Roger de Hoveden, i. 222 (Rolls ed.); Gervas, *Chron. l. c.*

[3] Roger de Hoveden, *l. c.*; Grim. (Giles), i. 31; R. de Pontigny (Giles), i. 127.

[4] And if, as is said by some, he did afterwards seal them, this is still more strange.

[5] Grim, R. de Pontigny, *u. s.*

manded, but to exempt Becket from its control,[1] which would only have made confusion worse confounded. Becket, indignant at this half-hearted support, determined to plead his cause personally. He had also other matters to complain of. The Archbishop of York had caused his cross to be carried before him in the province of Canterbury, and the Pope would not forbid him the privilege except in the *Diocese* of Canterbury. Gilbert Foliot, translated from Hereford to London, would not make a profession of subjection to the archbishop, upon the ground that he had already made it as bishop of Hereford. The prior of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, demanded the benediction to be given to him in his own abbey, and refused to come for it to the cathedral. At this moment Becket stood absolutely alone, but his spirit did not quail. He embarked privately at Romney, determined to seek out the Pope at Sens. But the sailors, finding that he had not the king's permission to leave the country, were afraid to proceed, and the archbishop was accordingly brought back.[2] It would have suited the king's purpose well for the Primate thus to have offended against the law, and the morning after his departure the king's officers appeared at Canterbury ready to confiscate his goods. But his presence sent them away in confusion.

12. In the meanwhile the king and his advisers had been carefully deliberating how they might best humble and subdue the archbishop, and thinking that they had found a means of doing so by calling Becket to account for his administration of affairs when Chancellor, a council was summoned to meet at Northampton, October 6, 1164. The weapons now to be used against him were scarcely honourable ones. Becket had obtained a full acquittance and discharge as to all his judicial and fiscal proceedings when Chancellor, before his consecration to the primacy.[3] At his first coming to Northampton a petty insult was

[1] His first idea was to make the king Legate, exempting Becket from his control.—Roger de Hoveden, i. 223; Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1388.

[2] Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1389.

[3] R. de Diceto, i. 314; Grim, *Vita S. Thomæ* (Giles), i. 15; R. de Pontigny (Giles), i. 108.

offered to the Primate. He found the lodging destined for him in the monastery of St. Andrew, full, and no place reserved for him and his attendants. Upon this the Primate sent word to the king that he should not stay unless proper provision were made for him, and he carried his point.[1] He was then called to answer before the council, on the charge made against him by John the Marshal, that he had been refused justice in his court. He met the charge by a bold denial; but the barons adjudged him to pay a fine of five hundred pounds.[2] The shock and annoyance of this probably unfair sentence made Becket ill. But the king was not disposed to spare him. He formally summoned him to give an account of his receipts as Chancellor. He was called upon to account for the revenues of all the bishoprics, abbacies, benefices, which during vacancy had been paid to him; for the receipts from the wardenship of Berkhamstead and Eye; and for numerous matters which he could not possibly answer off-hand, and as to which he had received no intimation beforehand that he would be required to give an account. Such a proceeding was altogether unworthy the magnates of a kingdom, and it is not to the credit of the bishops that they joined in supporting it. To them, however, in his perplexity the Primate resorted for advice. The chronicler Gervase has preserved the substance of the answers made by them. The bishop of London recommended unconditional submission, and for Becket to humble himself before the king. Henry of Winchester counselled resistance, on the ground that such interference as the king meditated was destructive of the liberty of the pastoral office. Hilary of Chichester made a fine speech,[3] the purport of which was submission. Bishop Robert Chesney of Lincoln, a simple and unpretending man, thought that the archbishop's life was in danger, and he had better yield. Bartholomew of Exeter thought that Becket had better be sacrificed than the whole Church of England be imperilled. Roger of Worcester thought the

[1] R. de Hoveden, i. 224.

[2] Grim, *Vita S. Thomæ* (Giles), i. 40; R. de Pontigny (Giles), i. 133.

[3] Gloriosus in verbis.

matter so full of danger that he would rather not say anything.[1] There was not much counsel to be found in his brethren, who were evidently in the greatest terror of the king. But the archbishop could not bring himself to yield so as to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the council, and to defend and explain his accounts before it. He obtained a delay till the 13th October, and it was intimated to him that if he did not appear and plead on that day his life would not be safe.[2] The bishops, on the morning of that day, besought him with tears not to ruin himself. They recalled to him the fact that he had sworn to the Constitutions of Clarendon, and that for having repudiated them he might be treated as a traitor. The archbishop replied that he deplored that oath; but having made a wicked promise, it was better to break it than to keep it. He upbraided the bishops for having sat in judgment upon him, their father, in conjunction with temporal barons, and inhibited them on their obedience from doing so any longer. Then he declared that he appealed to Rome.[3] After this he put on his vestments, and going into the church, said the mass of St. Stephen, implying thereby that he was preparing for martyrdom. He then went, carrying his cross in his own hand, to the council chamber.[4] The bishops strove earnestly to induce him to put away the cross, but he refused. Gilbert Foliot cried aloud in anger, "You have always been a fool, and to-day your folly will appear manifest." The king, hearing that the archbishop was approaching in this solemn fashion, retired into an inner chamber with his barons. After a time the bishops were summoned to him, and the Primate left alone in the outer hall. The bishops reported the inhibition which had been pronounced against them, and the archbishop's appeal to the Pope. They offered themselves to appeal to the Pope against him. The king, turning to his barons,

[1] Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1390.

[2] Gervas., *Chron.*, 1391; R. de Hoveden, i. 226.

[3] Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1391.

[4] There are so many varying accounts of this famous scene in the Lives of Becket, that it is impossible to reconcile the whole of the statements. I have mainly followed Gervase. See also Grim, *Vita S. Thomæ* (Giles), i. 43; R. de Pontigny (Giles), i. 136.

ordered them to judge this perjured and contumacious person. They agreed to a sentence. Robert, Earl of Leicester, went out and was about to notify to the archbishop his sentence, when he was stopped by him and commanded, on the allegiance which he owed to his spiritual father, not to venture to do so. He hesitated, and then arose a general cry that the perjured and contumacious one should depart from the court. Becket looked round fiercely on those thus insulting him, and said, "Were it not for my orders, I would defend myself in arms against those who dare thus to accuse me." He then turned and left the court with dignity. The door of the castle was locked, but one of his attendants found the key, and Becket retired to the church of St. Andrew, where he occupied himself in devotions. Sending then for three of the bishops who were best affected to him, he despatched a message to the king, asking for leave to depart from the country. The king said he would give his answer to-morrow, but Becket, fearing violence, in the first watch of the night, after solemnly reciting a litany, went secretly from the church, and finding one of the gates of the town unbarred, escaped, accompanied only by three companions, and made his way safely to Lincoln. From Lincoln he proceeded by cross roads, and journeying by night, to Estrey, a vill belonging to the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury. Here he remained in concealment until he could get a boat to convey him across the Channel. He landed on the beach near Gravelines, and being wearied with the tiresome walk across the mud, his two companions hired a sorry horse for a penny to carry him and his effects. In this fashion they arrived at the monastery of Clair Marais, near St. Omer, where the brethren willingly received him.[1]

13. Henry, on discovering the flight of the archbishop, sent at once letters to the King of France, informing him that Thomas, a traitor, late Archbishop of Canterbury, had escaped into his territories, and desiring him not to allow him a refuge in his dominions. The king's letters were

[1] Gervas., *Chron.*, pp. 1391-2; Roger de Hoveden, i. 228, 229; Grim, *Vita S. Thomæ* (Giles), i. 48, 49; R. de Pontigny (Giles), i. 142-6; William Fitz-Stephen (Giles), i. 218, *sq.*

carried by a goodly band of ambassadors, comprising no less than five bishops—Roger of York, Gilbert of London, Bartholomew of Exeter, Roger of Worcester, Hilary of Chichester—and many clerks of less dignity, and barons. Louis, instead of acceding to Henry's request, paid all honour to Becket, and the ambassadors, finding themselves unable to effect anything with the king, hastened on to the Pope at Sens. They arrived before Becket, and a consistory being immediately granted to them, they pleaded the king's cause. Gilbert Foliot spoke first, blaming earnestly Becket's rash proceedings in embroiling the Church with the king. The Pope checked him for his vehemence, and he became mute. Then Hilary of Chichester began a stilted harangue against Becket, but making an unfortunate slip in his Latin, there was a general burst of laughter in the court.[1] The Archbishop of York said he knew well the obstinacy of Becket, and that there was no hope of getting over the difficulty but by the Pope's interference. The bishop of Exeter desired the Pope to appoint Legates to hear the cause. Then the Earl of Arundel spoke in English of the high respect felt by the King for the Pope, and his desire that he would interpose to settle these unhappy differences. The Pope paid great attention to this speech, and in answer to it said that he had the highest regard for the English king, and as they desired to have Legates to settle this quarrel, they should have them. The bishop of London then asked that the Legates might have the power of settling the matter without appeal. To this the Pope would not consent. In a few days the Archbishop of Canterbury arrived, attended by a gallant train of knights. Being at once admitted to a secret audience by the Pope, he declared to him that it was not for a light cause he had left England; that there had been great love between him

[1] His words were—"Et certe virum tantæ auctortatis id non decuit nec oportuit, nec aliquando *oportuebat*, insuper sui si saperent non oportuerunt in talibus præbuisse assensum." Audito itaque qualiter facundus ille rhetor et grammaticus et causidicus prosiliret de portu in portum soluti sunt in risum universi.—Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1395.

and the king, and he might easily be reconciled to him, but only at the cost of irreparable mischief to the Church. He then produced a copy of the Constitutions of Clarendon. As these were read aloud there arose groans, and tears were shed in the Papal Curia, so terribly did they appear to contravene the rights of Holy Church. Subsequently, at a more private interview, the archbishop acknowledged with tears that the ills which had overtaken the English Church were due chiefly to himself. He, he said, had climbed up into the sheepfold, and not entered by the true way of canonical election. The fear of the secular power had brought about his appointment. Had he, however, resigned it, as his enemies demanded, he would have inflicted still greater scandal on the Church by obeying unauthorised commands. Now, however, before the true ruler of the Church, he solemnly resigned that post into which he had been unduly thrust. Then he took off his episcopal ring, and placing it in the Pope's hands, removed to a distance from the Cardinals. The Pope and Cardinals held a short consultation. Some thought a way out of the difficulty was thus opened for them, and that the archbishop might be otherwise provided for. But others thought this course would be base and mean, inasmuch as the archbishop had boldly stood for the right, even to the peril of his life. He was therefore reinstated in his position, and promised every sort of help and support.[1]

14. But promises were all that Becket was to obtain from the Pope, who at that time had a most difficult part to play.[2] He was, no doubt, well disposed to aid Becket, but he feared Henry. The most, therefore, that he could do for the archbishop, was to recommend him to the care of the abbot of Pontigny, while he sent as conciliatory messages as possible to the king of England. Henry was not a man likely to be satisfied with soft words. He united a wonderful political instinct with the most unbridled passions, and he now proceeded to give one of the worst proofs of his violent nature. He not only seized the archbishop's goods, but he drove into exile, pillaged

[1] Gervas., *Chron.*, pp. 1293-1298 ; Grim, *Vita S. Thomæ* (Giles), i. 52.

[2] See Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, iii. 478.

and destitute, all his relatives, dependants, and friends, to the number of about 400, who, with a refinement of cruelty, were forced to swear that they would present themselves to the archbishop at Pontigny, that he might be the spectator of the mischief he had wrought. By a public edict, the king forbade any one in England to communicate with and aid the archbishop, or even to pray for him.[1]

15. While Henry thus raged, the archbishop, in his retreat at Pontigny, had ample opportunity for reviewing the past and considering the future. The accounts of his life in the abbey are somewhat contradictory. Some of his biographers assert that it was that of a mortified and self-torturing ascetic; but there are other passages which seem to represent the archbishop as too much addicted to luxurious living and free indulgence in food and wine.[2] It was on St. Andrew's day 1164 that Becket sought this retreat. During his stay there, throughout the whole of the year 1165, he was revolving projects of resuming the strife with the king of England. He was so much occupied with the study of the canons and the false decretals, that one of his friends, John of Salisbury, wrote to him to remonstrate against such studies, and to recommend the devotional study of the Scriptures. Happy would it have been for Becket had he taken this good advice, and saved himself from the long undignified squabble which he now entered upon with the king. He had, during 1165, three times cited Henry to submit to his censure; and on these invitations being very naturally disregarded, he was preparing to excommunicate him, when he received a letter from Pope Alexander checking his bitterness, and bidding him at any rate to stay proceedings against the king till after Easter (1166). At length, however, his desire to curse his enemies could be no longer restrained; and on Ascension-day, in the cathedral of Vezelai, the archbishop solemnly excommunicated John of Oxford, promoted to the deanery

[1] Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1398.

[2] See, for Becket's life at Pontigny, Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops*, ii. 436-443. I do not, however, see that the passages quoted prove any excess on the part of Becket.

of Salisbury and divers others, clerks and laymen, by name, whom he judged to be most hostile to him; and finally all those who upheld, observed, or defended the Constitutions of Clarendon.[1] This general curse, if it meant anything, included the king and almost the whole nation. Henry's counter-move was to order the persons cursed to appeal against Becket's sentence, and to send forth Becket from his retreat at Pontigny by declaring that he would expel the whole Cistercian order from his dominions if the abbot harboured him any longer.[2]

16. Upon hearing of these violent proceedings at Vezelai, the bishops of the English Church addressed a strong letter of remonstrance to the Primate, which was penned or inspired by his great opponent Gilbert Foliot:[3] but such remonstrances had but little effect upon the archbishop.[4] He always treated the bishops who were opposed to him with a scornful indignation. He excommunicated the bishop of London and the bishop of Salisbury. Being fully persuaded in his own mind, he refused to listen to any suggestion of yielding, and repeatedly declared that he was prepared for and expected martyrdom. During the four years that he remained at Sens, where the king of France had given him an asylum after his expulsion from Pontigny, he waged a continual and internecine war against all who upheld the claims of the secular authority to interfere with the privileges of ecclesiastics. He was surrounded, indeed, with a band of devoted friends, and everywhere, both in France and England, the common people were with him; but the Pope only feebly supported, and sometimes openly checked him. The king and the barons, the great Churchmen of England, were all against him. It is impossible not to admire the courage of the man. Much fault may, no doubt, be found with his temper, his language, his persistent enmities; but his was a grand figure, contending fear-

[1] R. de Diceto, i. 318.

[2] Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1400; Grim, *Vita S. Thomæ* (Giles), i. 59; R. de Pontigny (Giles), i. 155.

[3] R. de Diceto, i. 321; R. de Hoveden, i. 262.

[4] The answer to this letter, addressed to Gilbert Foliot, will be found R. de Diceto, i. 323; R. de Hoveden, i. 256.

lessly for what he believed to be the right. To detail all the proceedings of these four years would fill a volume. The Pope issued no less than four commissions to Legates to endeavour to settle the dispute; all the chief men of the day were more or less mixed up in it. The letters which passed, the negotiations which took place, were endless. At length Henry, wearied out with the strife, and unable to bend the firm spirit of the archbishop, or to curb the rising power of the Church, determined to yield all.[1] At Freteval, on July 22, 1170, the king and the archbishop met. Great cordiality prevailed. Henry agreed that Becket might inflict ecclesiastical punishment on the bishops who had wronged him by taking part in the coronation of the young king. Of the Constitutions of Clarendon nothing was said. The archbishop was free to return to England; he embarked at Whitsand, and landed at Sandwich, December 1, 1170.

17. Unhappily the archbishop did not return in peace, but with his spiritual sword drawn in his hand. He had obtained letters from the Pope suspending the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Durham for having crowned Prince Henry in the province of Canterbury, and without exacting from him an oath to preserve the privileges of the Church;[2] and another letter to the bishops of London, Salisbury, Exeter, Chester, Rochester, Llandaff, and St. Asaph, suspending them in like manner for having joined and concurred in this act; while the bishops of London, Salisbury, and Rochester, being old offenders against the archbishop, were excommunicated.[3] Having obtained these weapons of offence, Becket proceeded to use them skilfully. Had he brought them himself, his purpose would have been frustrated. The bishops were well aware that he had obtained letters against them, and were on the look-out to seize them on his arrival as contraband and illicit. An

[1] This temper on the part of the king was no doubt greatly due to the complications arising from his unfortunate mistake in suffering his son to be crowned by the Archbishop of York. There was an imminent danger of an interdict.—See Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 474.

[2] R. de Diceto, i. 310; R. de Hoveden, ii. 7.

[3] R. de Diceto, i. 340-1; R. de Hoveden, ii. 8.

ordinance of great severity, passed in the preceding year, had made it highly penal to bring any papal letters into the country.[1] But Becket had contrived, by means of an unsuspected messenger, to convey these letters into the country before his own arrival;[2] and the bishops found themselves suddenly stricken with the terrible bolt of a papal excommunication before the coming of their great opponent. Becket was therefore saluted on his arrival with a fierce demand upon him to undo this work and to absolve the bishops. He informed the king's officers who made this demand, that if the bishops of London and Salisbury would solemnly swear henceforth to obey him, he would absolve them.[3] He was unmoved by the menaces hurled against him by Ralph de Broc and others, and cheered and exhilarated by the enthusiastic joy with which the people everywhere received him. From Canterbury he proceeded to London, where the excitement was immense; but even here he put forth some excommunications.[4] Being ordered not to approach the court, which was at Woodstock, Becket returned to Canterbury. Preaching on Christmas Day on the text, "Peace on earth, goodwill towards men," he illustrated his subject by breaking forth in a furious curse against Nigel de Sackville, Ralph and Robert de Broc.[5] These men may have deserved his censure, but the occasion and the manner terribly illustrate the unrelenting character of the man. Meantime the bishops smitten with the papal curse hastened to seek the king, whom they found in the neighbourhood of Bayeux. They complained of the conduct of the archbishop in excommunicating them for doing that which they had done at the king's command. Henry was excited to fury, and was perhaps all the more furious

[1] R. de Hoveden, i. 231.

[2] Some say the messenger was a nun. Gervase says the letters were conveyed by a boy who had come with Robert, the sacristan of the church of Canterbury, to make preparations for the archbishop's return.—*Chron.*, p. 1413. See also R. de Pontigny (Giles), i. 150.

[3] R. de Diceto, i. 342.

[4] See William Fitz-Stephen, *Vita S. Thomæ* (Giles), i. 285; Grim (Giles), i. 66.

[5] R. de Diceto, i. 342.

because he remembered that he had himself consented that the archbishop should censure these bishops. Probably he had not expected anything so severe as a papal excommunication. In his passion he shouted out the well-known words which availed to send four of his knights in all haste to Canterbury.[1]

18. The four knights[2] arrived in Canterbury on December 28, and took up their quarters with the abbot of St. Augustine's. They probably hardly knew what they were going to attempt, but had a general purpose of insulting, terrifying, and humbling the archbishop on the following day (December 29).[3] They first went to him unarmed, and with the object, as it seemed, of reproaching him with his conduct to the king, and demanding the absolution of the bishops. An angry colloquy took place. Fitz-Urse was the spokesman for the knights. He told Becket that he spoke in peril of his life. There was no sign of timidity about Becket. He defied them to do their worst. The knights rushed out for their arms. The doors of the palace were barred. Sounds were soon heard of some one hewing at them with an axe. His friends implored Becket to take sanctuary in the church. He refused. Then he was told it was the time for vespers. The bell was tolling. The archbishop went in his usual state into the church.[4] The monks were rushing to close the door into the cloisters. Becket would not allow them to do so. The church, he said, must be open to all. The monks were too terror-stricken to continue the service. The archbishop stood calmly waiting for his enemies. They

[1] See Grim, *Vita S. Thomæ* (Giles), i. 68. Grim altogether acquits the king of intending Becket's death.

[2] Reginald Fitz-Urse, William de Tracy, Hugh de Morville, Reginald Brito.

[3] The year of course, according to our reckoning, was 1170, but it is frequently dated 1171, because it was the custom of many to begin the year from the Nativity, while others began it at the Annunciation.—See Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1418.

[4] There is a conflict of testimony here. William Fitz-Stephen, who was present, says he walked into the church with his cross carried before him.—Giles, i. 299. R. de Pontigny says the monks carried him bodily into the church.—Giles, i. 165.

were soon upon him, shouting, "Where is the traitor? Where is the archbishop?" "Behold me, no traitor, but a priest of God," was the reply. After a violent altercation they seized Becket, intending probably to drag him out of the church and to make him a prisoner.[1] But the archbishop resisted stoutly. He had been a brave soldier in his day, and knew not how to fear. He seized a pillar. He struck De Tracy to the ground, and hurled a foul epithet at Fitz-Urse.[2] Then Fitz-Urse aimed a blow at him with his sword. It was partly arrested by the devotion of his faithful attendant Grim, whose arm was nearly severed.[3] When Becket felt the blow, and saw the others preparing to strike, he seems to have resisted no longer, but recommended his soul to God and the saints. Then they all wreaked their vengeance upon him, and leaving his mangled body on the pavement, rushed away to plunder.[4]

19. The horror produced by this great crime was excessive. The king, who could not feel himself clear from having contributed to it, fasted and wept. He was able, no doubt, truly to declare that he had never meditated or intended bodily harm to the archbishop. He had determined to seize and imprison him, though not by the agency of these knights. He obtained absolution from the Pope, though with difficulty, and at the cathedral of Avranches in Normandy, Henry having sworn that he had not sought the death of Becket, but deeply grieved for it, and having made certain promises supposed to be in favour of the Church, was, after a formal flagellation, reconciled to the Church. One of the promises which the king made at

[1] They tried to force him upon De Tracy's back, who was to carry him off.—R. de Pontigny (Giles), i. 167.

[2] *Lenonem appellans.*—Grim, *Vita S. Thomæ* (Giles), i. 76.

[3] Grim, i. 77.

[4] The particulars of the murder of the archbishop are of course recorded by all his numerous biographers. Of these Grim was an eye-witness and a fellow-sufferer with Becket, whom he gallantly tried to save. Gervase has also a graphic account of the murder. He had been admitted as a monk, and had also received holy orders from Becket.—*Chron.*, p. 1418.

Avranches was to abrogate some at least, if not all, of the Constitutions of Clarendon.

20. The murder of Becket was an unmixed evil to the Church of England. He had been a trouble to the Church during his life. He was a far greater mischief to it in his death. His fate was straightway elevated to the dignity of a cruel martyrdom, and thus all his violent policy, all his anti-national projects, were invested with a divine halo, and became rooted in the affections of his countrymen. As the opponent of the king and barons he had ever naturally been the favourite of the people, and much of the old English national sentiment of hatred of the conquering Norman race was mixed with the feelings which he inspired. This contributed greatly to excite the enthusiasm with which his memory was hallowed. The nation gave itself up madly to the worship of St. Thomas. The king was constrained by the strength of the popular feeling to approach his tomb in the guise of the most abject penitence, and the policy of the Constitutions of Clarendon was much discredited. These Constitutions offered a fair promise for the administration and working of a national Church. "They are no mere engine of tyranny or secular spite against a Churchman. They are really a part of a great scheme of administrative reform, by which the debatable ground between the spiritual and temporal powers can be brought within the reach of common justice, and the lawlessness arising from professional jealousies abolished."[1] They remained, indeed, to be the groundwork of later legislation, and a most valuable testimony to the opinions of the day in which they were promulgated. But numberless troubles and contentions between Church and State, and the rapid growth of the Pope's intrusive power, proved the great evil of their temporary abrogation. At the time they were drawn up they were unanimously accepted by the bishops. We have a remarkable testimony from Becket himself that the reverence for the Pope had almost ceased in England. "But for me," he wrote to Alexander, "and my fellow-exiles, all authority of Rome had ceased for ever in England. There would have been no one to maintain the

[1] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 465.

Pope against kings and princes."[1] The reverence paid to St. Thomas was extended to Rome, which, though it had only feebly upheld him in life, yet canonised him after death. No Churchman desiring to stand well with his people could now take national ground. The martyr triumphed where the living Churchman had failed. And yet it was only by an utter misuse of terms that the death of Becket could be called a martyrdom. He died like a brave soldier contending against ruffian assailants who had no authority to attack him, and no power to accept any undertaking on his part had he been willing to make one. There was no question of principle involved in his death. The four savage knights had a hatred of their own to appease, and a hope to win a reward from the king whose secret wishes they supposed themselves to know. Becket withstood them as he would have withstood robbers in a wood, who sought to plunder his treasure. It was the sanctity of the place where the deed of violence was done, and the great antecedents of the man who had so long contended with kings and popes, that gave a special character to the murderous act. This sufficed to make all Europe shudder, and to bring it about that the cause which Becket had espoused became so strong that no secular power could for a time resist it.

[1] Giles, *Letters of Becket*, iii. 55.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A) THE EARLY LIFE OF THOMAS BECKET.

The father of THOMAS BECKET was Gilbert, a citizen of London. Of his mother a romantic story is told that she was a Moslem girl, who had learned to love Gilbert in Palestine, and sought him out on his return to England in London. Thomas was born 1117. He was taught at London, then at Oxford, afterwards at Paris. His abilities and manners recommended him to Archbishop Theobald, into whose service he was taken. Here he continued to enjoy high favour. He was made incumbent of Brantfeld, then archdeacon of Canterbury. On the accession of Henry II. he was recommended by the archbishop for the place of Chancellor, in which he served the king well. He proved himself a skilful diplomatist, and showed also considerable prowess as a soldier, leading an expedition against Cahors,

which he took, and seizing and imprisoning a marauding chieftain named Wydo de la Val. He was remarkable for the pomp and splendour of his appearance and retinue, and for the great expense in which he indulged. His ready zeal to assist the king in repressing the robber nobles of Stephen's reign and the excesses of some of the clergy, led the king to suppose that he would also zealously support his policy when made archbishop.

(B) THE CONSTITUTIONS OF CLARENDON.

1. If dispute shall arise between laymen concerning advowson and presentation to churches, or between laymen and clerks, or between clerks, the matter must be treated and settled in the court of the lord king.

2. Churches of the fee of the lord king cannot be given in perpetuity without the assent and concession of the king himself.

3. Clerks accused and charged with any matter, being summoned by the king's justice, shall come into his court, to answer there concerning that upon which it shall seem right to the king's court that answer should be made there, and in the Church court concerning that which shall seem right to be answered there; so that the king's justice shall send into the court of Holy Church to see in what manner the thing shall be treated there. And if the clerk shall have been convicted, or have confessed, the Church ought not to defend him any longer.

4. It is not lawful for archbishops, bishops, and parsons of the kingdom to go out from the kingdom without the license of the lord king. And if they go out, if it shall please the lord king, they shall give security that neither in going, staying, nor returning, they shall do evil or mischief to the king and kingdom.

5. Excommunicates ought not to give pledge for the future, nor to take oath, but only security and pledge of abiding by the judgment of the Church, that they may be absolved.

6. Laymen ought not to be accused, except by certain and legal accusers and witnesses, in the presence of the bishop, so that the archdeacon may not lose his rights, nor anything that he ought to have from thence. And if they who are blamed shall be such that no one is willing or dares to accuse them, the sheriff, being requested by the bishop, shall cause twelve legal men of the vicinity, or of the town, to swear before the bishop that they will show the truth in that matter according to their conscience.

7. No one who holds of the king in chief, nor any of his officers of the lordship, shall be excommunicated, nor the lands of any of them placed under an interdict, until first the lord king, if he be in the land; or his justice if he be outside the kingdom, be applied to to do right with respect to him; and so that what shall belong to the king's court be there settled, and what shall belong to the Church court be sent to it to be treated there.

8. In appeals, when they occur, from the archdeacon they ought to proceed to the bishop, from the bishop to the archbishop. And if the archbishop fail to give justice, last of all recourse must be had to the lord king; that by his precept the controversy may be ended in the court of the archbishop; so that it ought not to proceed further without the assent of the lord king.

9. If a quarrel arise between a clerk and a layman, or between a layman and a clerk, concerning a tenement which the clerk wishes to bring to franc-almoign, but the layman to a lay fee, it shall be settled by the award of twelve legal men, by the consideration of the chief-justice of the king, whether the tenement belongs to franc-almoign or to the lay fee. And if it shall be awarded to belong to franc-almoign, it shall be pleaded in the Church

court; but if to lay fee, unless both claim under the same bishop or baron, it shall be pleaded in the king's court. But if both claimants make their claim for the fee under the same bishop or baron, it shall be pleaded in his court; but so that on account of the award he who was first seised of it shall not lose seisin until it shall have been proved by the plea.

10. If one who belongs to a city or castle or town or manor of the lord king shall have been cited by the archdeacon or bishop for any crime for which he ought to answer them, and he be unwilling to satisfy their citations, it is permissible to put him under an interdict; but he ought not to be excommunicated before the chief officer of the lord king in that town be applied to to cause him to come to satisfaction. And if the king's officer fail in that respect, he shall be at the king's mercy, and from that time the bishop shall be able to restrain the accused person by law ecclesiastical.

11. Archbishops, bishops, and all parsons of the kingdom who hold of the king in chief, hold all their possessions of the lord king as a barony, and from them must answer the justices and king's officers, and follow and do all rights and customs royal, and, as other barons, must be present at the judgment of the king's court with the barons, until that the judgment comes to mutilation or death.

12. When an archbishopric or bishopric, or abbey or priory, in the lordship of the king be vacant, it ought to be in his hand, and he shall receive from it all rents and profits as belonging to the lord. And when the time comes for consulting the Church, the lord king ought to send for the more important persons of the Church, and the election ought to be made in the chapel of the lord king, by the assent of the lord king and the council of the chief persons of the kingdom, whom he shall have called to do this. And there the elect shall do homage and fealty to the lord king as his liege lord, concerning his life and limbs and his earthly honour, saving his order before he be consecrated.

13. If any of the chief men of the kingdom hinder by force the archbishop or bishop or archdeacon from trying him or his men, the lord king ought to use law to him. And if by chance any one shall have held back by force from the lord king his right, the archbishops, bishops, and archdeacons ought to use law to him to make him satisfy the lord king.

14. The chattels of those who are outlawed by the king, the Church, or the cemetery must not detain against the king's justice, because they are the king's, whether they have been found in the churches or without.

15. Pleas for debts which are owed with a promise, or without a promise, are in the king's cognisance.

16. The sons of rustics ought not to be ordained without the assent of the lord on whose land they are known to have been born.—Stubbs, *Select Charters*, pp. 132-134; Johnson's *Eng. Canons*, ii. 50, *sq.*

CHAPTER XVI.

THE GROWTH OF THE POWER OF ROME IN ENGLAND.

1171-1213.

1. Papal exemptions of monasteries. 2. St. Alban's obtains exemption. 3. Claims made by Christ Church, Canterbury. 4. Archbishop Richard's complaint of the license of the monasteries. 5. Claim of the Canterbury monks to elect the Primate "freely." 6. Election of Richard, Prior of Dover. 7. Confirmed by the Pope; claim to confirm suffragan bishops. 8. Henry's penance at the shrine of St. Thomas. 9. Destruction of Canterbury Cathedral. 10. Council of Westminster, 1175. 11. The Roman Legate allows the clergy to be subject to the forest-laws. 12. Clerical appointments at the Council of Woodstock. 13. Quarrel between the two archbishops at Westminster. 14. A Legate arriving without leave summarily stopped. 15. Henry's foundation of three monasteries. 16. National feeling among the bishops. 17. Election of Archbishop Baldwin; beginning of quarrel with Canterbury monks. 18. Nature of the quarrel; success of the monks. 19. Preparations for a crusade; the archbishop takes the cross. 20. Council of Pipewell; ecclesiastical appointments. 21. Secular prelates; Archbishop Hubert Walter. 22. St. Hugh of Lincoln. 23. Archbishop Hubert Walter obliged to take down the church at Lambeth. 24. Hugh, bishop of Coventry, obliged to restore the monks. 25. Suspension of Archbishop Geoffrey of York. 26. Hubert Walter holds Legatine Synod at York. 27. Accession of Innocent III.; the advance in papal power. 28. Archbishop Hubert Walter yields to the Pope. 29. The Council of Westminster, A.D. 1200. 30. Effects of the contemporaneousness of Innocent and John. 31. The disputed election to the primacy. 32. The Pope's proceedings in the matter. 33. Letters between John and Innocent; Stephen Langton consecrated. 34. John's furious rage. 35. The Pope threatens an interdict. 36. The interdict published. 37. Effect of the interdict. 38. The King's reprisals. 39. John excommunicated; failure of the Pope's measures. 40. Pandulf's interview with John. 41. John's opposition collapses. 42. He surrenders his kingdom to the Pope, and does homage. 43. The bishops return and absolve the King.

1. For a period of six years the Church of England was practically without a Primate, and that too at a time when a reformation of ecclesiastical discipline was most urgently

needed. In the midst of his great struggle against the king, Becket had no time or thought for the administration of the ordinary business of the Church, and the other bishops were so absorbed in and mixed up with the strife, that their diocesan work must have been greatly hindered. There were other causes also at work at this time to hamper episcopal action. With the growing power of the Papacy began to grow up that most formidable obstacle to all good government—the system of granting exemptions to monasteries from episcopal control—exemptions which not only secured license to the parent house, but to all its *cells* and churches, and all in any way connected with it. There had been some exemptions secured by convents even before the Conquest. A privilege was granted to some houses of electing their own abbots, but the bishop had to approve the abbot and give him benediction. Others had the privilege of keeping the property of the house entirely independent of the diocesan.[1] But as yet no monasteries had the power of entirely excluding episcopal control. This license was first introduced by the Cistercians, that order being made everywhere entirely independent of bishops; but it was soon coveted and eagerly contended for by monks of other orders, and but too often with complete success. The first notable example of an abbey obtaining complete immunity from episcopal control by means of papal grants was that of St. Alban's.

2. The famous abbey of King Offa, which had suffered hard measure at the time of the Conquest, had nevertheless not ceased to grow in wealth and dignity. Its increasing power and importance led it to desire independence of that episcopal control which it felt to be humiliating to its greatness. An opportunity to effect this occurred, and it was eagerly used. It had been the strange fortune of St. Alban's to reject, on account of ignorance, a candidate for admission into its ranks, who was afterwards raised to the chair of St. Peter as Adrian IV. The Pope, instead of bearing ill-will to the society which had refused him in his youth, felt deeply grateful to it as having really thrown him in the way of his future advancement. Taking advan-

[1] Stubbs, *Introd. to Epist. Cant.*, xxviii.

tage of this feeling, the abbot Robert applied to Pope Adrian to relieve him of what he styles the "intolerable oppressions of the bishop of Lincoln," his diocesan; and the Pope, lending a ready ear to his request, gave him a bull which decreed that "all the dwellers in the monastery, all inhabitants of its dependent houses and of its vills, should be altogether free from subjection to bishops, and only be subject to the Roman pontiff." [1] He also appointed the Feast of St. Alban as a day to be observed in all churches, and ordered that the Whitsuntide *Processions* in the county of Hertford should no longer be made to Lincoln but to St. Alban's. At a subsequent period he also gave to the abbot the right of wearing the episcopal ornaments. These great privileges were, in spite of the opposition of the bishop of Lincoln, continued to St. Alban's by the following Pope. The matter came before the Council of Westminster (1163), and the king, though indignant at this papal interference, could find no better way of settling the difficulty than recommending the bishop to make a composition with the abbot. The monastery agreed to give its vill of Tynghurst to the See for a perpetual immunity for itself, and for fifteen churches immediately dependent on it, from episcopal control. The Processions of these churches were to be made to the abbey, and the abbot was allowed to wear the episcopal ornaments—the mitre, gloves, and sandals—and to preside in a synod at St. Alban's over his affiliated clergy as a bishop.[2] Such a precedent would soon find imitators, and nothing could be devised more thoroughly destructive of Church order, and more completely hampering to the bishops.

3. The same policy which appeared full blown at St. Alban's had been going on gradually at Canterbury. St. Augustine's, ever jealous of Christ Church and of its nominal abbot the archbishop, had long been contending for exempt privileges, and the same spirit was also manifested in Christ Church itself. This had, in fact, been encouraged both by Lanfranc and Anselm, in both of whom the

[1] Matt. Paris, *Hist. Sti. Albani.*

[2] Matt. Paris, *u. s.*; Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vi. 1276. The abbot of St. Alban's thus became the first mitred abbot in England.

monastic feeling was stronger than the episcopal. St. Thomas, who had assumed privately the monkish habit, which he wore under his episcopal robes, continued in the same course. He surrendered the offerings of the church to the monks, and his successor, who was an affiliated prior of the house, was not likely to oppose it. The history of Christ Church is a chequered one. It had sometimes been secular, sometimes monastic; but after 1070 it may be regarded as completely of the latter character. Its wealth and luxury became enormous, its pretensions overweening; so that an archbishop who was shortly to succeed, was constrained to embark in a strife against it which lasted many years, and excited the keenest interest in England, and indeed throughout Europe.[1]

4. Thus, inside the Church of England, as well as outside, were growing up influences unfavourable to discipline and subversive of episcopal action. The system of appeals to Rome, encouraged by that See for obvious reasons, was destructive of healthy local control. Abuses multiplied, but there was no power to check them. Within a few years an Archbishop of Canterbury thus wrote to the Pope: —"Abbots exalt themselves against primates and bishops, nor does any one exhibit reverence and respect towards his superiors. The yoke of obedience, in which was the only hope of safety and the remedy against former falsehood, has been shaken off. The abbots greatly detest having a corrector of their excesses. They embrace the licence of impunity, and, relaxing their bond of claustral warfare, give free scope to their desires. Hence it is that the property of nearly all the monasteries has been given over to spoliation and plunder. For the abbots outwardly follow the desires of the flesh, caring nothing, provided they make a fair show, and there be peace in their days. The brethren of the cloister, being as it were without a head, spend their time in ease and idle conversation, for they have no superintendent to bend them to a better course of life. Indeed, if you were to hear the stormy contentions, you would think their cloister differed little from a market.

[1] See the able Introduction to *Epistolæ Cantuarienses* by Professor Stubbs.

All this, reverend father, requires your seasonable correction ; for unless a speedy stop be put to this evil, is it not to be feared that as the abbots are released from the bishops, so the bishops will be from the archbishops, and the deans and archdeacons from the prelates?"[1]

5. The great *éclat* shed round the church of Canterbury by the merits of St. Thomas encouraged the prior and monks of Christ Church to assert overweening pretensions in regard to the election of his successor. There was no immediate attempt to provide a new archbishop. For a year all but nine days the church of Canterbury remained in mourning. The altars were stripped, the pavement torn up, the walls bared, the bells silent, and no divine offices were performed in the desecrated building. At length, on the humble petition of the convent, the suffragan bishops of the province met at Canterbury on the festival of St. Thomas the Apostle, and solemnly reopened the church with great pomp and rejoicing. Bartholomew, bishop of Exeter, preached on the occasion on the text, "In the multitude of the sorrows that I had in my heart, thy comforts have refreshed my soul."[2] The important matter of selecting a successor to St. Thomas began soon to be treated of. The king had solemnly purged himself from complicity with the murder, and been absolved.[3] The Archbishop of York, the bishops of London and Salisbury, had been relieved of their excommunication, and restored to their functions.[4] In August (1072) the young king and his bride arrived in England, and were crowned at Winchester by the Archbishop of Rouen.[5] On September 1, a synod was held at Windsor to appoint the new archbishop. Odo, the prior of Christ Church, demanded that the election should be left free to that body. This unheard-of claim astonished the council, but so great was the terror at the moment of the

[1] *Epp. Petr. Blesensis ;* Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops,* ii. 536.

[2] Ps. xciv. 19. R. de Diceto, i. 349.

[3] May 21, 1172. The ceremony was repeated September 27. R. de Hoveden, ii. 34, 35, note.

[4] R. de Diceto, i. 347, 348, 351.

[5] Gervase says that another insult was thus given to the church of Canterbury.—*Chron.*, p. 1421.

overweening pretensions of Churchmen, that it was only met by a request for delay. Odo was to return to Canterbury, and take counsel with his society.[1] At Michaelmas the bold prior repaired again to the court, and informed the council that he was still of the same mind. The election must be left free to the monks, or none would be made. The king's advisers could now think of no better expedient than sending the prior abroad to the old king in Normandy. The account of his reception shows very strikingly the enormous effect which had been produced by the murder of Becket. The king prayed the prior, even on his knees, and with outstretched hands, to have mercy upon him, and not to cause him to add another to his crimes. He earnestly implored him to choose the bishop of Bayeux, whom the chronicler describes as a simple man easily swayed from his purpose. The prior received the king's request with a stern haughtiness. He was not inclined to accept the bishop of Bayeux, or any one else, without the consent of his society. It was not for that purpose that he had crossed the sea. He returned to England, and again a council was held to endeavour to bring about the election; but as free liberty was not conceded to him, the prior went back to Canterbury without any election having been made.[2]

6. This new and preposterous claim for the monks of one convent to choose the Primate of England, as though he were simply their abbot, without regard to the king's will, without regard to the suffragan bishops, was altogether perplexing, and, in the state of feeling then prevalent, very difficult to contend with. A fresh attempt was made to bring about an election at Lambeth on March 2. The bishops, taking advantage of the fact that three abbots of Bec (Lanfranc, Anselm, Theobald) had succeeded to the chair of Augustine, and reigned with distinction, induced the Canterbury deputation to unite with them in selecting Roger, abbot of Bec.[3] But now a new difficulty arose from the pride and assumption of the monastery. Who was to

[1] Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1422.

[2] Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1423. (Christmas 1072.)

[3] Gervase writes as though the first choice of the abbot came from the convent. R. de Diceto seems to imply the contrary, i. 354.

announce the election? The bishops said this privilege belonged to the bishop of London; the monks, that it was the privilege of their prior. A compromise was at length effected, and Richard, archdeacon of Poitiers, was allowed to declare the election.[1] But the abbot Roger was not to be persuaded to undertake the perilous dignity. Whether it was from a love of religious retirement or from "littleness of mind," he could not be moved from his purpose, and the See of Canterbury was still vacant. Another council of bishops and clergy was summoned to meet at London at the end of April. Six bishops nominated by the king were appointed without difficulty,[2] but when it came to the election of Primate obstacles immediately arose. The same unheard-of claim was stoutly maintained by the prior of Christ Church, that the election should be freely left to the monastery. After much wrangling, it was determined to send an embassy to King Henry abroad, to ask for directions. The king gave no definite answer, but he appears to have sent private instructions to the Justiciary, Richard de Luci, that if the Canterbury monks would not yield, they must be allowed to have their own way. At the beginning of June the council met again, and Odo still being firm for a free election, the bishops agreed that the convent should choose two persons. They accordingly selected Odo their prior, and Richard, prior of Dover, a monk of their house. The bishops naturally enough adopted Richard, who took the oaths to the king in the chapel of St. Catherine's, Westminster, with the qualifying clause of "without prejudice to my order," and no mention whatever was made of the "ancient customs."[3] So completely for the moment had the cause of St. Thomas triumphed.

7. An unexpected obstacle arose to impede Richard's consecration. The young king, then on ill terms with his

[1] R. de Diceto, i. 356.

[2] Among these was Geoffrey, the king's natural son, a youth of twenty years of age, to the vast See of Lincoln. R. de Diceto says that the elections were free, but it is absurd to suppose that the young Geoffrey was freely chosen by the Lincoln chapter. Gervase says that the bishops were elected *ad libitum regis et curialium* (p. 1424).

[3] R. de Diceto, i. 369.

father, wrote to forbid it, and appealed to Rome.[1] The elder Henry, with an utter forgetfulness, as it might seem, of the policy which he had been so vigorously striving to advance, appealed also, and the disputed election thus was brought to the decision of the Pope. Previously to this (March 13, 1173) the Pope had addressed a letter to the bishops, clergy, and people of England, decreeing the canonisation of Thomas Becket, "whose life had shone with the great glory of merits, and who had at last consummated the glorious contest by martyrdom."[2] The letter was, as might be expected, received with infinite rejoicings, and the influence of Rome was paramount. It is probable that Henry, taking accurate account of the state of feeling, determined now, instead of vainly striving to oppose the ultramontane influence, to endeavour to triumph through it, and thus he threw his cause, in opposition to his son and the king of France, unreservedly into the Pope's hands. The character of the elect of Canterbury was no doubt well known to him. He felt sure that in him he should not have a second Thomas to contend with, and he was willing to sacrifice something to obtain for the Church of England a head so well calculated to soothe down the troubled and angry feelings which had been excited, and to bring about a more wholesome condition of things. Richard, the archbishop-elect, accompanied by Reginald the elect of Bath, reached Piacenza about Christmas (1173), and embarking at Genoa, arrived at Civita Vecchia after a nine days' voyage. The Pope was at Anagni, and with him were many who most violently opposed the consecration of Richard, bringing all sorts of evil accusations against him and his supporters. He was constrained to prove his freedom from simony, the legitimacy of his birth, and to show that he had taken the oath to the king with the approved reservation, "without prejudice to my order." At length he obtained the confirmation of his election (April 27, 1174), and three days afterwards was consecrated by the Pope, and the legateship conferred upon him.[3] The Pope having thus the primacy of the English

[1] Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1425. [2] R. de Diceto, i. 370.
[3] R. de Diceto, i. 389, 390; R. de Hoveden, ii. 59.

Church put into his hands, was inclined to keep his advantage to the utmost. He asked angrily why the other bishops-elect had not come to seek their confirmation from him. Especially why the elect of Ely (who was probably known to him) was not there.[1] The Pope thus began to claim the right not only of confirming the archbishop, over whose election he had always exercised a sort of control by the device of the pall, but of confirming the suffragan bishops also—an unheard-of stretch of power.[2]

8. Henry, pleased with having gained his purpose in the consecration by the Pope himself of one who, he felt sure, would not prove an intractable opponent, received the archbishop kindly on his homeward journey.[3] He was now preparing for that great act of self-abasement and humiliation, nothing less than which, he felt persuaded, would give him back the full confidence of his English subjects, and defeat his son's machinations against him. Before the archbishop had reached England (which was not till September 3, 1174), the king of England had conspicuously, and with every exaggeration possible, performed an elaborate penance at the shrine of St. Thomas. He landed at Southampton early in July, and restricting himself to a diet of bread and water, and refusing to attend to any matters of business, or even to enter a town, he hastened on towards Canterbury. On approaching that city he dismounted at the church of St. Dunstan, and walking with bare feet, and with every outward mark of the deepest penitence, he arrived at the great church on Friday, July 12. With tears, groans, and sobs, he made his way to the tomb of the martyr. There, prostrate with outstretched hands, he remained long in prayer. Gilbert Foliot, the bishop of London, Becket's most vigorous antagonist of old, preached a sermon. He declared that the king had in no way desired or sought the death of Thomas, but that

[1] Upon this Bishop Berter of Orleans ventured on a joke. "My lord," he said, "he has the excuse of the Gospels." "What excuse is that?" said the Pope. "He hath married a wife, and therefore he cannot come." The See was the wife.—R. de Hoveden, ii. 59.

[2] See Appendix A, Historical Sketch of Episcopal Appointments.

[3] Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1428.

his incautious words had been wrongly interpreted. The king himself repeated the same assertions publicly. For his rash words he desired now to receive chastisement. He then bared his back, and received from all the clergy present and the monks three or five blows each with a scourge. All day long, and during the night, he remained fasting and praying at the shrine. In the morning he arose, put on his garments, heard mass, and offered costly gifts at the martyr's tomb, assigning a rent-charge of forty pounds a year for providing lights. On the Saturday he departed for London. Then it was believed that the penance was accepted, inasmuch as news was brought to him that on the very day he left the church the king of Scots was captured at Richmond.[1]

9. Those who were so ingenious at interpreting passing events as indications of the Divine displeasure or approval, might with some reason, had they been so disposed, have read in the great calamity which soon afterwards befell the church of Canterbury the displeasure of the Most High at the pollution of His house by creature-worship. But this was a thought which probably occurred to none[2] amidst the fierce conflagration which consumed the church of Lanfranc. The great Norman cathedrals of England were singularly unfortunate. Within a short time the church of Remigius at Lincoln, the church of Herbert Losinga at Norwich, and the church of Lanfranc at Canterbury, suffered from fire. The archbishop was received at Canterbury amidst the ruins of the church (October 2), and enthroned as well as circumstances allowed; and on the following day he consecrated the four bishops whose non-appearance at Rome had excited the anger of the Pope,[3] Reginald, bishop of Bath, having been previously consecrated by him abroad.

10. The Church being thus furnished with prelates, and the king being at peace, the time was suitable for holding an ecclesiastical synod to consider and care for

[1] Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1427; R. de Diceto, i. 383-4.

[2] They were, on the contrary, inclined (as the chronicler says) to blaspheme the Lord and His saints for suffering such things

[3] Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1428.

the needs of the Church. If we except the pseudo-synod held by Alberic, the Pope's Legate (in 1138), it was nearly fifty years since an ecclesiastical synod had been held in England.[1] The meeting at Clarendon, though it was much concerned with Church laws, was a civil rather than an ecclesiastical assembly. But this meeting at Westminster, on the Sunday before Ascension Day, 1175, was purely ecclesiastical, being called by the archbishop (with the consent of the king), and consisting of eleven English bishops, the archbishop, the bishop of St. David's, and four abbots. The canons enacted were taken, for the main part, from the decrees of Popes and Councils, but they were in almost all instances somewhat altered.[2] From their provisions we gather the existence of considerable scandals in the Church. Canon 1 decrees that subdeacons and those above them in orders are to be unmarried, and that sons are not to be instituted to their fathers' benefices. By Canon 9, which orders that churches be not handed down as inheritances, we gather that this custom had become prevalent, and it is evident that clerical matrimony had by no means ceased.[3] Clerks are bidden not to frequent drinking bouts at taverns, not to take secular offices, or to be concerned in judgments about blood; not to wear long hair[4] or unseemly apparel. Bishops are not to accept clerks ordained in foreign dioceses. Churches are not to be used as law courts. No money is to be exacted for Church offices; clerks are not to trade for gain; deputies or curates are to be in subjection to their parsons; tithes are to be duly paid. Some curious directions as to the mass are given. Only ten proper prefaces are to be admitted.[5] The elements are not to be sopped. Chalices are to be of gold or silver, not

[1] The last was under William de Corbeil in 1129.

[2] See Johnson, *Eng. Canons*, ii. 59.

[3] When the son of a clerk, Nicholas Breakspere, had reached the Pontifical dignity, it is evident that clerical matrimony had sufficient encouragement.

[4] "Ab archidiacono etiam inviti tondeantur."—Gervas., 1430.

[5] In the Decretal of Pope Pelagius, which is referred to in the Canon, only nine prefaces were sanctioned. A tenth, in honour of the blessed Virgin, was added by Pope Urban in 1095.—Johnson, ii. 63.

of tin.[1] Marriage is to be public, with full consent of both parties. Marriages between infants are null.[2]

11. At this Council the old dispute between the Archbishops of Canterbury and York broke out again with great violence. During the Becket dispute Pope Alexander had, under the influence of the king, conceded to Archbishop Roger of York the right of having his cross carried before him in the province of Canterbury, though not in the diocese of the archbishop. Some clergy now claimed, on the Archbishop of York's part, the confirmation and extension of this privilege, and they threw in as a makeweight a wild claim made by him to all the Mercian dioceses. This of course was disallowed, and it was shown that in the discharge of the claim, made with some colour, for the jurisdiction of York over Lindsey, a composition had been formally given and accepted in the time of William Rufus.[3] York was to receive the church of St. Oswald in Gloucester, and the abbey of Selby, of which the bishops of Lincoln had been formerly patrons. Upon this it was retorted that the compensation was not a real one, inasmuch as the archbishop of Canterbury had excommunicated the clergy of St. Oswald for not accepting him as Metropolitan. The representatives of York therefore appealed to Rome. The authority of Rome was now so fully recognised, that the appeal was at once admitted, and in the following year a Legate *a latere*, Cardinal Hugo, was despatched to England to settle this and some other disputed questions. The king, seeing that in the present temper of the nation it was hopeless to attempt to coerce the clergy in spite of Rome, had now adopted the policy of governing them through Rome —a policy which he found much more easily worked than the other. Thus, lavishing his attentions upon Cardinal Hugo (whom he desired also to make useful in his contemplated divorce case), he arranged with him a sort of composition of the Constitutions of Clarendon, of which the following were the chief items :—(1.) Clergy not to be

[1] Yet tin was usually sanctioned, but not brass, because of the mixture of metals.

[2] Gervase, *Chron.*, p. 1429, *sq.* ; Johnson, *Eng. Canons*, ii. 59-64.

[3] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vi. 1271.

brought before secular judges in the first instance, except for transgressions of the forest laws, and in respect of lay fees which they may hold. (2.) Sees not to be kept in the king's hands above a year, except for urgent and manifest cause. (3.) Murderers of clerks convicted, or confessing, to be judged by the secular judge in the presence of the bishop. (4.) Clergy not to be compelled to accept wager of battle. That these arrangements were considered very derogatory to the privileges of the clergy may be gathered from what Gervase says :—"The Legate, seeking rather the favour of the king than of his flock, at the very beginning of his legation agreed that the king might implead clerks for taking game. Behold with how sad a beginning, and with what a portentous example, did a cardinal of the Roman Church commence his mission! Is this the safe security that Rome gives—that clerks should be dragged into lay courts and condemned there by secular judges?[1] But what is there that the accursed hunger for gold cannot do"?[2] Certainly a great step was thus made towards the return to the Constitutions of Clarendon, and a severe blow was struck against that policy which St. Thomas had so vigorously upheld.[3]

12. While the king was thus skilfully endeavouring to bring clerical malefactors within the reach of the law, he showed some disposition to relax his grasp upon clerical revenues, which for some time past, during the quarrel with St. Thomas, had been tightening more and more. The unfortunate See of Lincoln, which from the richness of its revenues was especially tempting to a needy monarch, had, after more than eight years of vacancy, been allowed to receive his nominee in the person of his youthful illegitimate son Geoffrey ;[4] and at a council at Woodstock (July

[1] Roger de Wendover, *Flor. Hist.*, ii. 385.

[2] Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1432.

[3] Dr. Hook (*Lives of Archbishops*, ii. 536) says that the *Constitutions* of Clarendon were renewed at Northampton, January 1176. But this is a mistake. It was the *Assize* of Clarendon which was then republished, which did not specially concern the clergy.—See Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 669, note.

[4] Geoffrey was nominated by the king in 1172, but not confirmed by the Pope till 1175. He took possession of the See, August 1 (R. de

8, 1175) Henry had, with the advice of the bishops, nominated the heads of no less than ten abbeys which had been kept for a longer or shorter time without their abbots.[1] John of Oxford, dean of Salisbury, who had been especially conspicuous in the quarrel with Becket, was now made bishop of Norwich. About the same time the diocese of Canterbury was divided into three archdeaconries, it having before been all included in one.[2]

13. In March (1176) an attempt was made to settle the questions in dispute between the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, which had been the ostensible reason of the journey of the Legate into England. A synod was held in St. Catherine's Chapel, Westminster,[3] on March 14, in which a strange scene occurred. Roger, Archbishop of York, had advanced a claim to take precedence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to sit at the right hand of the Legate, grounding himself on the old constitution of St. Gregory, that of the two Metropolitans of London and York, that one should have precedence who had the prior consecration. He maintained that Canterbury stood in the place of London as the metropolis of the southern province, and that he, as the senior, ought to have precedence. He forgot that the whole matter had been carefully investigated and settled by a council in 1070, and that the scheme of St. Gregory, which had never been carried out, had then been finally abrogated. Determined to try to carry his point by force, Archbishop Roger, finding on his

Diceto, i. 401), and held it till January 6, 1182, when the Pope insisting that he should either resign or be consecrated, he chose the former. There was no appointment made to the See for nearly two years after this, so that when Walter de Coutances succeeded in the winter of 1183, the See of Lincoln had been kept without a bishop for very nearly seventeen years. [1] R. de Diceto, i. 401. [2] *Ib.*

[3] St. Catherine's was the chapel of the infirmary. Why was not the synod held in the abbey church? Probably on account of the dispute which had arisen between the Legate and the abbot of Westminster. R. de Diceto tells us that the bishop of London had given to the newly-elected abbot the right of wearing the episcopal mitre and gloves. But the Legate, not thinking himself to be treated with proper respect, had forbidden the abbot to wear the mitre, and also interdicted the prior from entering the choir of the church.

arrival at the chapel the coveted post already occupied by the Archbishop of Canterbury, endeavoured to squeeze himself between him and the Legate, but was dragged down from his seat by main force by the suffragans of Canterbury, assailed with blows, his cope torn, and overwhelmed with abundance of abuse. The injured archbishop carried his complaint to the king, exhibiting his torn garments and demanding justice, while the Legate in disgust gave up the attempt to settle the quarrel, and would have left the country forthwith, had he not been delayed by the earnest request of his friends.[1]

14. Cardinal Hugh had been needed for the king's policy, and Henry had contrived to make him useful to himself by obtaining his consent to bringing the clergy within reach of the forest laws. But the king of England was not yet prepared to receive a Legate *a latere* from the Pope to intermeddle in the affairs of the English Church whenever his Holiness should please to despatch one. Accordingly, when Cardinal Vivian arrived in England in July, he was at once greeted, on the part of the king, with the demand by whose authority he had dared to enter the kingdom without the king's license.[2] The terrified Legate declared himself ready to make oath that he would do nothing in England without the permission of the king, and on this understanding he was allowed to pass through the country on his way to Scotland. Probably, had he not been thus somewhat roughly dealt with, the Legate would have endeavoured to take up the matter which his predecessor had failed to settle, and to make some agreement between the two Metropolitans. This was partially effected at a synod held at Winchester (August 15, 1176), at which the rival archbishops agreed to a truce for five years, the Archbishop of Rouen and the French bishops in the meantime being requested to examine into and arbitrate upon the matters in dispute, and both the English archbishops undertaking to abide by their decision.[3]

[1] There are varying accounts of this scene. William of Newbury says that the Archbishop of York arrived first and took his seat.—*D Reb. Ang.* iii. 1. See Gervas., *Act. Pont. Cant.*, 1674; *Chron.*, 1433; R. de Diceto, i. 405; R. de Hoveden, ii. 92.

[2] R. de Hoveden, ii. 99.

[3] *Ib.*

15. It has been observed that Henry skilfully used the prevailing reverence for Rome and its Legates to wrest a privilege from the clergy which he could not compass by straightforward and legitimate means. Somewhat of the same tortuous policy may be traced in the way in which the king discharged the vow made on the tomb of St. Thomas to found three monasteries. The monasteries must be founded to satisfy public opinion, but the king determined that it should not be to him a costly matter to discharge his vow. The tide was at the highest in favour of pure monasticism. The hair shirt of St. Thomas, the glories shed around the Canterbury monks, were in the mouths of all men. In proportion as the purely ascetic system was raised, so was the utilitarian system of colleges of prebendaries, designed to study and teach, lowered. The king, taking skilful advantage of this, induced or compelled the Dean of Waltham, the famous collegiate establishment of King Harold, to resign his dignity and rights into the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury.[1] The prebendaries shortly followed his example, and Waltham thus falling into the king's hands, was *founded* as a house of canons regular, in discharge of one part of the obligation incurred by the king.[2] A second part was still more easily performed. The nuns of Amesbury had become notorious for their incontinence. They were removed and incarcerated in divers houses, and the king invited over from Fontevrault a band of French sisters to take their places.[3] The third item in the account has perplexed some of the chroniclers, but it was doubtless considered to be discharged by the establishment at Witham, in the wilds of Somersetshire, without any help indeed for their buildings or support from the king, of a few Carthusian recluses. The settlement at Witham had well-nigh perished, when it was saved from extinction by the coming of the famous Hugh

[1] R. de Wendover, ii. 387.

[2] R. de Hoveden, ii. 118. For an account of the foundation of Waltham, see Chap. X. The prebendaries are accused by the *monk* Gervase of "mundanis operibus et illecebris illicitis plus quam divino servitio intendentes."—*Chron.*, 1434.

[3] R de Hoveden, ii. 119.

of Burgundy to act as its prior.[1] Nothing could well have been meaner than such a performance of a solemn vow, and it is hardly possible to avoid judging that the king regarded the whole matter with the utmost contempt, and only did what barely sufficed to satisfy the popular sentiment.

16. In contending against the advancing spirit of papalism the king found considerable support from the bishops. Archbishop Richard was in every respect a happy choice, and governed the Church well and wisely. There is extant a letter of his which condemns in the strongest manner the exemption from secular justice claimed for all crimes wherein a clerk was concerned either as a doer or a sufferer. "By this accursed jurisdiction, which we ambitiously and proudly take to ourselves, we offend God and our lord the king, and open a secure way to laymen to ill-treat the clergy."[2] What wonder if with sentiments so entirely opposed to the ultramontane and Romanising party, the archbishop has been roundly abused by them?[3] Nor were the suffragan bishops, for the most part, eager to cast themselves into the arms of Rome. It is remarkable that at the Lateran Council of 1179, where so much good and valuable work was done, only four English bishops were present, while the abbots were in great numbers. "For," says the chronicler, "the bishops of England have constantly asserted that to a general council of our lord the Pope only four English bishops ought to be sent to Rome."[4] Again, when the Pope who succeeded Alexander III., being in trouble with his rebellious Romans, desired help from Henry, the bishops, being consulted as to the way the aid should be given, answered that they had nothing to urge against the King's granting a subsidy to the Pope as he thought fit, both on his own account and theirs; but that they would far prefer to pay

[1] Girald. Camb., *De Instit. Pont.*, ii. 7; *Magna Vita S. Hugonis* (ed. Dimock), Rolls Series. [2] Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops*, ii. 518.

[3] In the matter of the abbot of St. Augustine's he had ventured flatly to disobey the Pope's peremptory summons to go to Rome.—Gervas., *Chron.*, 1444. See for the monkish view of him Gervas., *Chron.*, 1465. [4] R. de Hoveden, ii. 171.

their contributions to the King himself, rather than that he should allow the Pope's envoys to collect money in England, "inasmuch as that might be turned into a precedent for the injury of the kingdom."[1]

17. On February 17, 1184, Richard, Archbishop of Canterbury, died somewhat suddenly. In him the Church of England had a great loss, and the misfortune of his death was increased by the prospect of a difficult and stormy scene in the election of his successor. For the monks of Canterbury still held most firmly to their inordinate pretensions of having the right to elect the Primate of England with entire freedom, as though he were merely the abbot of their church; and in the present state of feeling about the church of Canterbury their claims were most difficult to deal with. The suffragan bishops, on the other hand, claimed the right of election for themselves,[2] while the king strove to mediate between the two bodies, and to bring them to consent to the election of the same person, promising that he would confirm and accept any election so made. The chronicler Gervase, a Canterbury monk, gives at great length the various negotiations and disputes between the monks and the bishops, first at Windsor and then at London. The result was that the bishops in the first place elected Baldwin bishop of Worcester; but as the Canterbury convent utterly refused to concur in an election so made, the king declared it null and void. Then the prior and monks of Canterbury, satisfied with this tribute to their power, unanimously made the election of the same person, and so Baldwin was happily translated to Canterbury.[3] A better choice could not have been made. Baldwin had been a Cistercian

[1] R. de Hoveden, ii. 283. The monk Gervase says of the bishops —"In omnibus ecclesiæ necessitatibus maximis regis magis quam dei favorem quærebant.—*Chron.*, p. 1471.

[2] "The claim of the bishops to take part in the election of the archbishop, which was occasionally enforced during the twelfth century, was rejected by Innocent III., and was never revived afterwards."—Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii. 305. See Appendix A.

[3] Gervas., *Chron.*, 1468-1474. The account of the election given in the *Life of Baldwin* differs a little. See p. 1675.

abbot, and was on this ground not distasteful to the monkish feeling. He had, as bishop of Worcester, won golden opinions by his devotion and boldness.[1] "He was a man," says Professor Stubbs, "of singular sanctity, courage, and honesty. He was one of the most distinguished scholars of his time, and has left behind him works which attest his proficiency in the studies of the day."[2] To such a man the state of the monks of his cathedral church was of necessity offensive. They were luxurious, proud, independent, despising the authority of the archbishop, raised to the utmost pitch of arrogance by the popularity which attached to the shrine of St. Thomas, and by the vast wealth which flowed into their treasury. Archbishop Richard had made the offerings of the church over to the convent, and in consequence their riches were immense. "The refectory was the scene of the most abundant and tasteful feasting. Seventeen dishes were served up at the prior's table. The servants and equipages of a hundred and forty brethren were numerous and splendid. The monastery had become a little town in which the prior was supreme both temporally and spiritually."[3] Looking at their internal condition, together with their pretensions to dominate the Church of England by electing the primate of their own free choice, it was clear to the new archbishop that the monks of Christ Church needed some abatement of the position which they had taken up. Baldwin therefore commenced a strife against them, which lasted throughout his primacy and that of his successor; and in which the monks, aided by Rome, ever the zealous upholder of abuses, were able to withstand the power of the Primate, though supported by the king, and practically to maintain their ground.

[1] Especially on the famous occasion when he rescued a malefactor undeservedly condemned, and actually already hanged (R. de Hoveden, ii. 286). Dr. Hook says the man was hanged again next morning, but this was not the case. He was kept in prison till the death of the king.

[2] *Introd. to Epist. Cant.*, p. 34. His works are published in the fifth volume of the *Bibliotheca Patrum Cisterciensium.*

[3] Stubbs, *Introd. to Epist. Cant.*, p. 32.

18. Into the complicated details of the struggle between the archbishop and the convent it is impossible here to enter. The letters which passed on the subject fill a large volume,[1] and the chronicler Gervase, who was himself a prominent member of the contending body, has left a minute history of it. The way in which the archbishop attacked the convent was by erecting, at Hakington, near Canterbury, a collegiate church of secular clergy, which was to be occupied by distinguished men, the suffragan bishops of the province and the king himself having stalls in it. There can be little doubt that this church was intended to be the mother church of England, to elect the archbishop, and to supersede and reduce to insignificance the monastery. It was to be endowed out of the estates of the monks; the offerings at the cathedral were taken from them, and bestowed upon it; some of the churches of which they enjoyed the tithes were in like manner appropriated to it. It was therefore a question of vital importance to the monastery, and the prior and monks proceeded to contend against the archbishop's scheme with every weapon which they could find to their hands. Rome was of course their great hope, and of the three popes who rapidly succeeded each other at that period, two were strongly on their side, while Gregory VIII., who favoured the archbishop, lived but for a very short period. They had also in their support the great influence of the Clugniac order of monks, which was bitterly opposed to the Cistercians, who favoured the Primate. The archbishop had the aid, more or less open, of the king and the Grand Justiciary, R. de Glanvil. He had with him also almost all the suffragan bishops and the courtiers. But the public opinion of what may be called the religious world was against him. The reverence for St. Thomas, whose community was supposed to be attacked, the high estimation in which the monastic discipline was held in comparison with the secular, were strongly in favour of the monks, and thus it was that they were able to hold out against him, and ultimately to obtain a partial triumph. For during

[1] Edited by Mr. Stubbs for the Rolls Series. His admirably lucid *Introduction* gives a very clear account of the quarrel.

the long space of eighty-four weeks, in which the monastery was shut up and the monks detained as prisoners to make them yield to the archbishop's demands, they were so well supplied that two hundred strangers were daily fed with the superfluous contributions.[1] The archbishop acted with great vigour. He treated with open contempt on several occasions the papal mandates obtained by the monks.[2] But in the end, at the commencement of the next reign, he agreed to demolish the church at Hakington, and to remove the prior whom he had placed over the monks at Canterbury, while the remaining matters of dispute between them were to be reserved for arbitration.[3] The whole history well illustrates the tremendous power which the monastic body had now acquired. The king might well complain that "he was a king only in name, that the power in England was divided into many parts, and that only a small part remained for him. This, that, and the other privilege were possessed by monks, white or black, and canons of different orders. Many even from foreign parts had their possessions in England. The secular clergy were depraved in morals, and only occupied in lawsuits. Rome with persevering hostility seemed to have nothing else to do but to exercise her power over him, to sell its letters of exemption, to multiply appeals, and to confound everything for the sake of money."[4]

19. The strife of Archbishop Baldwin with the refractory monks of Canterbury was interrupted by the engrossing interest attaching to the preparations for a new Crusade. The capture of Jerusalem by Saladin was known in Europe towards the end of 1187,[5] and caused the most intense excitement. One pope was popularly reported to have died of grief. Another pope published his letters exhorting all Christian persons to hasten to the rescue. The Emperor of Germany, the Kings of France and England, and Prince Richard, took the cross. The cardinals agreed to give up

[1] Stubbs, *Introd. to Epist. Cant.*, p. 61. [2] *Ib.*, pp. 48-49.

[3] *Ib.*, p. 77 ; R. de Hoveden, ii. 325. [4] Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1599.

[5] Jerusalem was captured Oct. 6, 1187. It was said that Pope Urban III. died of grief at the news, but this was hardly possible, as his death took place on October 20.

pomp and luxury, and to devote themselves to preaching the Crusade; and Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, gave himself with eager zeal to the same work. At a great council of prelates and barons held by the King of England at Le Mans, it was agreed that a tithe of all the revenues and goods of both laymen and clerks should be devoted to the Crusade. This tithe, called the Saladin Tithe, was to be collected in each parish by a committee formed of the parish priest, the rural dean, a Templar or Hospitaller, a servant and a clerk of the king, a servant and a clerk of the baron, and a clerk of the bishop. Clerks and knights who took the cross were not to pay the tithe, but all that their tenants had to pay, and all debts due to them, were to be collected and given to them. The bishops were to issue letters ordering the tithe to be paid at the Feast of the Purification. The Pope published an ordinance for the Crusade, declaring (1) that all sins confessed and repented of were forgiven to those who took the cross; (2) confirming the arrangement for the tithe; (3) ordering that none should swear enormously, nor play at dice, wear fine clothing, or indulge in luxuries, or take with them any women, save such as might act as laundresses; (4) that where lands have been pledged to creditors, the debtor should have the rents of the year for himself; that afterwards the creditor should receive the rents, but not as interest but in discharge of the capital sum; (5) that clerks or laymen might, for the purposes of the Crusade, pledge their revenues for three years; (6) that the moneys of all dying in the Crusade should be divided between the servants of the deceased, the fund for the sacred war, and the poor.[1] The king, after holding this council in his foreign possessions, returned quickly to England (Jan. 30), and at Geddington assembled another council of English prelates and barons (Feb. 11). At this gathering Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Gilbert, bishop of Rochester, preached with such telling effect, that great numbers, both of clerks and laymen, took the cross. The efforts of the archbishop to promote the cause of the Crusade culminated in himself taking the cross and assuming the scrip and staff

[1] R. de Hoveden, ii. 335-337.

of a pilgrim. Having made the best provision he could for the government of his province, and appointed Richard, bishop of London, his deputy, Archbishop Baldwin sailed from Dover (March 6, 1190), for the Holy Land, from which he was not destined to return.[1]

20. Before the departure of the archbishop for the Holy Land great changes had taken place in England. The talented and vigorous king, Henry II., had died sadly at Chinon,[2] and his eldest surviving son, Richard, had succeeded to his great inheritance. Richard had been received in England with the utmost joy, and crowned at Westminster, September 3, 1189, with exceeding magnificence; four archbishops, fifteen bishops, and almost all the abbots and priors of the country assisting at the ceremonial.[3] The rejoicings at the coronation were marred by the fearful riot and slaughter of the Jews which followed it, but this, it is to be feared, did not much affect the prelates and barons assembled, so bitter was the feeling cherished against the wretched Jews. On September 15 the new king held a great ecclesiastical council at Pipewell Abbey in Northamptonshire, with the object of filling up some of the numerous vacancies in Sees and abbeys which had been allowed to accumulate. The late king, who had experienced so much trouble from prominent Churchmen, seemed to desire to have as few of them as possible, and constantly refused to fill up vacant posts. The confusion, scandal, and injury to the Church through this neglect must have been enormous. The new king determined to begin his reign with a different policy, and proceeded to nominate to the vacancies. In doing this he had regard to the claims of those who had been the faithful servants of his father, but whom Henry, remembering his sad error in the case of Becket, had refused to transfer from secular employments to ecclesiastical rank.[4] To Godfrey de Luci, who had refused the bishopric of Exeter as not sufficient for his support, he gave the See of Winchester; to Richard, the Treasurer, and archdeacon of Ely, that of London; to William de Longchamp, his chancellor, that of Ely; to

[1] Gervas., *Chron.*, p. 1564. [2] R. de Hoveden, ii. 366.
[3] *Ib.*, iii. 8. [4] Stubbs, *Introd. to Epist. Cant.*, p. 80.

Hubert Walter, dean of York, that of Salisbury. Abbots were nominated to Selby and Glastonbury, the deanery and treasurership of York were filled up, and divers other appointments made. Some of these, indeed, were sufficiently remarkable, and utterly opposed to all notions of ecclesiastical fitness. Thus Geoffrey, the king's natural brother, who had been employed ever since his resignation of Lincoln in 1181 in secular and military affairs, was now advanced to the high dignity of Archbishop of York, while the same unfortunate church had thrust upon it as dean Henry Marshall, who was actually not in orders.[1] The new archbishop-elect, though he had not much claim of his own to advance, was nevertheless highly displeased at the appointments made in his diocese. He remonstrated against them so strongly that the king threatened to deprive him of the archbishopric, and of all his goods at home or abroad.[2]

21. The prelates now advanced by Richard were for the most part promoted in reward for merely secular services, and their subsequent career was of a purely secular character. At no period of our Church history, not even during the reign of Stephen, are topics of ecclesiastical interest more completely wanting than during the reign of Richard. Three prelates in succession—William Longchamp, Walter of Coutances, and Hubert Walter—exercised the great power of Chief Justiciary. Contentions, squabbles, and secular strife occupied the time and thoughts of all the leading Churchmen. In the north, Hugh de Poiset, bishop of Durham—but rather a great baron than a bishop—contended against the authority of Longchamp. Hugh Nonant, bishop of Coventry, the leader of the party of Prince John, was involved in similar bitter strife. The characters of both these latter prelates, as painted, indeed, by their enemies, are so infamous as almost to surpass

[1] He was ordained sub-deacon and deacon the same day soon afterwards. When he came to York, he could not obtain installation as dean, but only as a prebendary. The new treasurer was also refused installation.—R. de Hoveden, iii. 18.

[2] It is doubtful how far the threat was carried out, as we find Geoffrey afterwards enjoying the revenues of the See.

belief.[1] Archbishop Geoffrey, having been consecrated abroad, returns to England to mingle violently in the general contention. He is arrested, and dragged from the altar, denounced to the Pope by his clergy, but still he fights his way through the stormy scene. Everywhere there is confusion, bitterness, rancour.[2] The Archbishop of Canterbury dies abroad at the Crusade, and intrigues are rife for the primacy. An obscure bishop, Reginald Fitz Jocelin, bishop of Bath, obtains the appointment, much to the surprise of all (Dec. 2, 1191). He dies a few weeks afterwards, and the intrigues recommence. Hubert Walter, bishop of Salisbury, who had greatly distinguished himself in the Crusade, returns to England, and in the midst of the excitement for raising the king's ransom is elected Archbishop of Canterbury (May 30, 1193). Soon afterwards he adds to the highest dignity in the Church the highest also in the State, and as Chief Justiciary as well as Primate becomes practically the ruler of England. Hubert was a man of a far higher stamp than Longchamp and others of his secular contemporaries. He was loyal to his master, above self-seeking, an earnest Churchman, as well as a good statesman. But, hampered as he was by his administrative duties, he can hardly be regarded as a model bishop.

22. There was at that period in England perhaps but one prelate who could fairly be thus described. This was Hugh of Avalon, who had been advanced from the priory of the obscure monastery of Witham to the See of the great diocese of Lincoln by the resolute determination of Henry II., much to the astonishment and vexation of the rich and secular canons of Lincoln. The king had become intimately acquainted with Hugh in his retreat at Witham, to the forests in the neighbourhood of which monastery he often resorted in his hunting excursions. As the prior of a monastery founded by himself, and brought by his own special request from the Grande Chartreuse, it was natural that Hugh should attract his notice ; and as he got to know

[1] See Guil. Neubridg., iv. 14 ; R. de Hoveden, iii. 141-149.

[2] The history of this stormy period, and the doings of the various bishops, are well brought out by Mr. Stubbs in his Preface to the third volume of Roger de Hoveden.

the man, admiration and esteem were produced in the king by the many great qualities which he found in him. A man he was, utterly fearless, of keen intellect, of playful humour; an ascetic without sourness; devoted to spiritual things, but a shrewd observer of secular things; a hater of evil, but full of love to every form of suffering. Hugh powerfully influenced the talented but wayward monarch. Having procured his election to Lincoln in 1186, Henry lived with him on terms of friendship till his death; and his son Richard was destined to learn that there was one bishop at least that did not fear to oppose the ruinous exactions with which he was wasting the land, and to assert and successfully maintain the rights of the subject. He was to find, also, that this same prelate feared not to stand before the impetuous king with a courage equal to his own, telling him of his sins, and refusing to yield a jot to his illegal demands; so that Richard, conquered by the perfect constancy of the man, exclaimed—'If the rest of the bishops were such as he, no king or prince would dare to lift up his neck against them."[1]

23. The appointment of Hubert Walter to the primacy brought about a renewal of the strife between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the monks of Christ Church. The college projected and begun by Archbishop Baldwin at Hakington had been taken down, and the materials removed to Lambeth, an estate in which place the archbishops had lately acquired from the convent of Rochester.[2] In 1192 the buildings at Lambeth had made some progress. The jealousy of the monks was excited. Archbishop Hubert, after his accession, offered to remove the college to Maidstone if that would satisfy the monks of Christ Church. They declined. He then proceeded with the work at Lambeth. He held the property of the manor, which gave him a right to build a religious house if he pleased, and he offered to the monks certain conditions which seemed quite

[1] See *Magna Vita S. Hugonis*, lib. v.

[2] The archbishops had been tenants of the manor from the time of Anselm, who had ordained in the chapel and held a council there in 1100. His two successors ordained in the chapel.—Stubbs, *Introd. to Ep. Cant.*, p. 92.

sufficient to guard their rights; but the monks were obstinate. They believed themselves strong at Rome, and they were not mistaken. Innocent III., who succeeded the aged Celestine, upon hearing the representations of the monks, and without caring to consult Hubert, ordered the demolition of the church of St. Thomas at Lambeth within thirty days, on pain of suspension, accompanying this mandate with an order to the suffragan bishops to withdraw their allegiance in case of Hubert's refusal.[1] This extremely audacious invasion of the liberties of Church and State called forth the ire of King Richard, who sent the archbishop orders not to obey it. The king now took up the cause somewhat warmly, and used some severe measures towards the convent. The archbishop was rather intent on having the matter reheard at Rome. It was reheard, and the Pope repeated his former mandate. The archbishop yielded. The church of the Lambeth College was levelled to the ground. The king, indignant, seized upon the estates of the monks; and he perhaps might have forced them to yield, but his death prevented further action. The dispute continued, but the archbishop was really powerless against the prestige of the Canterbury convent, backed by the power of Rome in the vigorous hands of Innocent. As Baldwin had been defeated at Hakington, so was Hubert at Lambeth,[2] and the monastic interest triumphed.

24. It was the same in another case of dispute between monks and canons which was proceeding about the same time. Hugh de Nonant, bishop of Coventry, had expelled the monks from his church, and had substituted prebendaries in their room (1191). The character of this prelate was probably a bad one, otherwise even his enemies could scarcely

[1] Letters 434, 435 of *Ep. Cant.*, p. 391 (Rolls ed.) R. de Diceto says:—"Data fuit Petro potestas ædificandi, potestas multiplicandi, potestas transferendi sedes, sed quâ lege, quo canone sit indulta licentia diruendi locum sanctum judicet Ipse qui potestatem dedit Ædificandi" (ii. 165). The church was demolished about January 1199. The archbishop was allowed to found a small college of Premonstratensian canons, if he desired, but not out of the revenues of Christ Church. —See R. de Wendover, iii. 134.

[2] For the terms of the final arrangement, see Stubbs, *Introd. to Ep. Cant.*, p. 109.

have ventured to bring such accusations against him.[1] It is said that he came to personal encounters with the monks, and exhibited himself black and blue from their blows in the council of Westminster. It is certain that he was the bitter enemy of the order, and advised Richard to send all the monks to the devil, and substitute canons for them in all the cathedrals.[2] His policy, however, was not successful, even in his own cathedral. The struggle lasted for some years ; but in 1198, which was also the year of the bishop's death, Archbishop Hubert, and Hugh, bishop of Lincoln, acting under a precept from the Pope, restored the monks to Coventry.[3]

25. In the meantime, some high-handed proceedings were taking place in the diocese of York, which well illustrate the rapid advance of that complete tyranny which the popes now began to exercise over the Church of England. Archbishop Geoffrey, whose arrival in England, after his consecration, had been greeted by an arrest by Longchamp, the justiciary, but who had contrived to escape from his enemies and establish himself in his diocese, had been signalising his presence there by a very unepiscopal career. If we are to lend any credence to his enemies, the archbishop gave himself up to sports and pleasure, never doing any episcopal act save to curse his opponents when any one resisted his will, indulging the most open simony and high-handed injustice.[4] Among other arbitrary acts, he had appointed a dean to the cathedral church, and the canons, resenting this invasion of their privileges, put the church under suspension, and left their places.[5] At the beginning of January (1194), the archbishop appointed new canons in the place of those who had quitted their posts. This stirred up the superseded clerks to action, and they repaired to Rome, where they prayed for the confirmation of their right to elect their dean, while the clerks of the archbishop argued against them for the rights of their master. The Pope,

[1] See Hoveden, iii. 149.

[2] Stubbs, *Introd.* to R. de Hoveden, vol. iii. p. 54.

[3] R. de Wendover, iii. 126 ; *Annal. de Oseneiâ, Ann. Monast.*, iv. 49.

[4] See Letter of Pope Celestine, Hoveden, iii. 312

[5] R. de Hoveden, iii. 222.

declining to enter into the question of right, appointed a dean by his own plenary authority, thus taking upon himself to dispose of an English benefice without any regard to legal claims.[1] Then the canons of York brought their heavy complaints against the archbishop for his misdeeds ; and the Pope issued a commission to Hugh, bishop of Lincoln, the archdeacon of Northampton, and the prior of Pontefract, to examine into the charges against the archbishop, and to report to him. The delegates went to York to hear the charges (January 15, 1195), and having reduced them to writing, forwarded them to the Pope, giving notice to Geoffrey that, within the space of four months and two weeks, he was to appear at Rome to answer them.[2] The archbishop excused himself from appearing; and, being again cited and not appearing, the Pope issued a letter of suspension against him, and appointed the new dean of York to superintend the diocese in spirituals.[3] But, though the mandate for the archbishop's suspension was duly received by him, Hugh, bishop of Lincoln, utterly refused to give effect to it by pronouncing the sentence ; and when pressed earnestly by the canons to act, declared that he would "rather be suspended himself than suspend the archbishop."[4] Now, as the good Bishop of Lincoln was fully acquainted with the many unepiscopal acts of Archbishop Geoffrey, it would seem that his refusal to act must rather be attributed to his dislike of the Pope's high-handed interference in an English diocese, than to his approbation of Geoffrey's conduct in his office.

26. If the saintly Hugh was of this mind, as much cannot be said of Archbishop Hubert Walter, with whom, indeed, Hugh of Lincoln was never on friendly terms. He readily accepted the office of Legate from the Pope, and by virtue of it proceeded to hold a council in the archdiocese of York (1195). The assembly should, perhaps, rather be styled a court than a council, as there was no other bishop present, and the Legate gave forth his decisions in the form of decrees rather than synodical resolutions. These decrees were on the following points :—The first three are provi-

[1] R. de Hoveden, iii. 230.
[2] *Ib.*, iii. 282.
[3] *Ib.*, iii. 309.
[4] *Ib.*, iii. 305.

sions for the decent and devout celebration of the mass; the fourth forbids masses to be said for money payments; the fifth orders three sponsors at baptism; the sixth forbids deacons to baptize, or deliver the sacred elements, or impose penance, except in case of necessity; the seventh regulates the repairs of churches; the eighth orders the coronal tonsure for clerks; the ninth forbids the use of copes with sleeves; the tenth orders that in Church suits justice should be administered gratis; the eleventh enjoins the full payment of tithes; the twelfth forbids monks and nuns to leave their convents, or to use any secular employment; the thirteenth orders perjurers to be excommunicated; the fourteenth forbids priests to keep concubines; the fifteenth regulates the process against clergy of bad morals.[1]

27. The accession of Innocent III. to the popedom (1189) is an important event in the history of the Church. He exercised a vast influence over the whole Church, and not least over the Church of England. Under him the power of the Popes, which had been steadily growing during the twelfth century, reached its highest point. Gregory VII. had first devised the great scheme of making the Pope the feudal head of Christendom. Innocent perfected the idea, and carried it out in practice with the most signal success. By one exercise of Papal power after another, the Church of England had been brought into a position, relative to the Pope, altogether different from that which it occupied under the Conqueror. Then Papal decrees and Papal interference could only come through the chief of the State, and with his permission. Now, though the State struggled against it, the Pope governed the Church of England immediately, and almost irrespective of the State power. The State had lost the power of investing bishops, and almost that of nominating them. Appeals on every conceivable subject of internal Church matters were made to Rome. The King himself had appealed in the matter of an episcopal election. The Pope claimed the right not only of confirming the archbishops, but even the suffragan prelates. The Archbishop of Canterbury was his officer, and held councils by virtue of that authority. The attempt to

[1] R. de Hoveden, iii. 294-297.

bring the clergy under the common law of the State had failed. The monastic order, which rested entirely on Rome, everywhere triumphed over the secular clergy. Owing in great measure to the fame which surrounded the memory of St. Thomas, the popular sentiment was completely with Rome, and in favour of the highest stretch of ecclesiastical self-assertion. It only needed a man of the commanding power and high character of Innocent III. to perfect the work, and to make the national Church of England, which in old times had been independent of external rule, a simple tributary dependency of the foreign Church of Rome. No doubt the deception wrought upon men's minds by the false decretals had done much, the Crusades probably more, in accustoming men's minds to contemplate with tolerance the vast fiction of a universal ecclesiastical empire; but the genius and boldness of Innocent gave form and power to the prevailing sentiment, and made it dominant throughout Christendom.

28. The keen glance of the new Pope at once detected a weak spot in the ecclesiastical armour. So long as bishops and clergy were employed in secular matters, and were the ministers of the State, they must be more or less under State influence, and not alive to ecclesiastical impressions alone. Accordingly, the Pope at once discouraged this, which a man of less insight might have thought likely to add power to the Church. Archbishop Hubert Walter was ordered to resign the office of Chief Justiciary. This direction came upon him at about the same time as the first order to pull down his church at Lambeth. He obeyed the Pope in both matters. The King would probably have supported him in his retention of the justiciarship[1] as he showed himself ready to do in the other case. But the archbishop, conscious of the overmastering power of the Pope, yielded meekly. Indeed, he seems to have completely accepted the full extent of the Papal claims. In the two councils which he held at York and Westminster he inserted a clause into the decrees, "saving in

[1] It is said by Hoveden that the Pope ordered the king to remove him (iv. 48), but it does not follow that Richard would have been ready to accept so unheard-of an interference.

all things the honour and privilege of the holy Church of Rome," and in holding these synods he acted as Legate rather than as archbishop. The council held at Westminster (A.D. 1200) was in fact held in defiance of the prohibition of the Chief Justiciary (Geoffrey Fitz Peter), who represented the king in his absence;[1] so that the archbishop was brought to make common cause with the Pope[2] as against the secular power.

29. In the council held by Archbishop Hubert at Westminster most of the decrees resembled those of the York Synod, but there are some noteworthy points of difference. These are chiefly drawn from the decrees of the valuable Lateran Council of 1179; *e.g.*, the retinues of the prelates are curtailed. An archbishop is not to exceed fifty men and horses, a bishop thirty, an archdeacon seven, a rural dean two. They are not to make their visitations accompanied by hounds and hawks, nor are they to exact procurations except where they actually visit churches. The object of the visitation is to see that every church has a silver chalice, proper vestments for the priest, necessary books and utensils for the sacrament of the Eucharist. A direction is given to include ill-doers under a *general excommunication* pronounced annually, which appears to have been a practice then growing, but which was of most evil consequence, as it tended to bring the sentence of excommunication into utter contempt.[3] By a very salutary regulation—also taken from the Lateran Council—Templars, Hospitallers, and other religious orders are obliged to present priests to the bishops for the churches which they hold not by an absolute right, "that there may be some one answerable to the bishops for the care of the people, and to the parson for the temporals." This was, in fact, to decree the establishment of *vicarages*, an institution which owes its origin to the Lateran Council

[1] Johnson, *Eng. Can.*, ii. 84.

[2] Yet he accepted the chancellorship—a secular office, but not so purely secular as that of Chief Justiciary.

[3] From this grew the device of *ipso facto* excommunications, an absurd attempt to manipulate solemn Church censures for politic purposes. See Johnson, *Eng. Canons*, ii. 88, note.

of 1179, and which did something towards alleviating the mischiefs that came upon the Church from the practice of heaping the advowsons of churches upon the religious orders.[1]

30. It is one of the wonderful coincidences of history that the greatest and most vigorous of the Roman pontiffs should have been contemporary with the worst and weakest of the English kings. Of this the immediate result was the utter prostration of the Church and realm of England before the footstool of Rome. But the ultimate result was far otherwise. Out of this very prostration and the yearning for liberty which it produced, sprang an ever-increasing movement towards national life and freedom in the Church of England, which continued to gather force until it was completely developed in the sixteenth century. Taking example from the great prelate through whom the Church received its most severe humiliation—but who, like Becket to King Henry, was "splendidly ungrateful" to the Pope—famous bishops, such as Edmund Rich, Robert Grosseteste, and others, preserved the tradition of nationality up to the vigorous days of Edward I.; and the Popes found that in spite of the precedents of the days of Innocent, they had to deal in the English Church not with a mere tributary branch of the Roman See, but with a national Church having its own laws, customs, privileges, and powers.

31. It was the inordinate ambition of the Canterbury monks (which had assumed such a height in the last few elections to the primacy, and which Innocent III. had done very much to flatter[2]) that led immediately to the troubles which now fell upon the English Church. Hubert Walter died July 12, 1205, and immediately—without waiting for the king's license—secretly, by night, a party of the monks of Christ Church proceeded to elect Reginald, their sub-prior, to the primacy—to seat him upon the high altar and the archiepiscopal throne, and to despatch him in all haste to Rome, to surprise, if it were possible,

[1] Wilkins, *Concil.*, i. 505; Johnson's *English Canons*, ii. 84-94.

[2] See his letter to the suffragan bishops of Canterbury. Matt. Paris, *Chron. Mag.*, ii. 490 (Rolls ed.)

the Pope's consent.[1] The hasty and secret election was made probably rather to escape from the interference of the suffragan bishops, which the monks always so much resented, than to avoid that of the king; and it might, perhaps, have been accepted by the Pope had the elected person been such as he would have desired to place in the primacy. But Reginald was a shallow and vain man, who spoiled his chance by parading his title and showing his letters of election on his journey to Rome; consequently he was received coldly at Rome, and the Pope told him he would wait for more information in the matter.[2] Meanwhile, as soon as the Canterbury monks perceived that Reginald had forfeited his chance of the primacy by his weak behaviour in Flanders, ignoring their first choice, they applied to the king for license to choose a primate. John received their application readily, being bent upon obtaining the election of John de Gray, bishop of Norwich, his most trusted counsellor. The monks returned to Canterbury; and as an opportunity was now open to them both of obliging the king, whose anger they dreaded on account of the clandestine election of Reginald, and at the same time of forestalling their rivals, the suffragan bishops, they at once elected John de Gray. Upon his election the king went to Canterbury with the archbishop-elect and put him in possession of the temporalties.[3] This took place towards the end of 1205, and at the beginning of 1206 the king despatched to Rome certain of the Canterbury monks, under the guidance of Elias de Brantefeld, to obtain the Pope's acceptance of the bishop of Norwich. This false move on the part of the king[4] was probably due to his anxiety to

[1] R. de Wendover, iii. 183; Matt. Paris, *Chron. Mag.*, ii. 492. It is said that it was a knot of the younger monks which did this; but there is good reason to believe that had the sub-prior conducted himself prudently, and not made ostentatious parade of his dignity, and had the Pope regarded the choice favourably, the other monks were prepared to acquiesce.

[2] R. de Wendover, iii. 183; Matt. Paris, ii. 492.

[3] R. de Wendover, iii. 184; Matt. Paris, ii. 493.

[4] It is evident that if John had taken no notice of Rome, but simply left the archbishop to apply for the pall, he would have stood on much better ground.

overcome the resistance of the suffragan bishops, who, not having been consulted in the election, and not liking the person elected, had also repaired to Rome to appeal against John de Gray. Thus all the parties to the two elections had put themselves into the hands of the Pope, and Innocent had a grand opportunity of exhibiting his autocratical power.

32. He first disposed of the suffragan bishops, and having examined their claim to elect conjointly with the monks, summarily put it aside with the haughty ruling; "On you and your successors we impose a perpetual silence as to the right of electing the Archbishop of Canterbury. The monks of Canterbury we free by a definite sentence from all interference and molestation from you and your successors."[1] Having thus got rid of one appeal, Innocent proceeded at his leisure to examine the others. The few monks who supported Reginald had now been at Rome for more than a year, and had again and again prayed for a confirmation.[2] The king's messengers had also been many months in attendance when the Pope (December 1206) condescended to give his sentence. Both elections were declared void—that of Reginald as hasty and clandestine, that of John de Gray as having been made before the prior election was disposed of.[3] The ground being thus cleared, the Pope ordered the Canterbury monks then present to proceed to a fresh election. Up to this point his action had been justifiable. All parties having appealed to him, it was right that he should pronounce his sentence. But by what right he could order a new election to be made, as if he were already King of England, does not appear. A still greater intrusion on the rights of the English Church was made when the Pope not only bade the monks elect then and there, but also told them who was to be elected —namely, Cardinal Stephen Langton, his own friend and fellow-student, then present at Rome. This was completely to ignore the existence of the King of England and the ancient rights of the Crown. The Canterbury monks trembled, as well they might, for they were aware that in

[1] R. de Wendover, iii. 188; Matt. Paris, ii. 496.

[2] Præsentaverunt Reginaldum, sicut multotiens fecerant. — R. de Wendover.

[3] R. de Wendover, iii. 212.

making this election they would be doing not only an act of treason, but also an act of perjury, as they had sworn to the king to elect no one else but Bishop Gray.[1] They alleged, therefore, that they neither had the king's consent nor that of their own house to make the election. But the Pope, says the chronicler, "catching the word out of their mouths, 'Know,' saith he, 'that you have plenary power in the matter of the church of Canterbury, nor is it our custom at the Apostolic See to wait for the consent of princes in making elections. We bid you, therefore, make the election by virtue of your obedience and under the penalty of an anathema, and we bid you elect him whom we nominate as your father and pastor.'"[2] What could the frightened monks do except obey the imperious order? Only one of them, Elias de Brantefeld, their leader, was bold enough to resist, and Stephen Langton was elected by them.

33. It remained to be seen how King John would bear this grievous insult and summary overthrow of his plans for his friend Bishop Gray. He had been quietly superseded in one of the undoubted prerogatives of his crown; would his temper, naturally impatient, submit tamely to such an outrage? The Pope probably thought that he would do so. He sent home two of the Canterbury monks with directions to ask the king to send deputies to give his consent to Langton's election. When nothing came of this (for the monks were detained at Dover), he wrote a letter by his own messenger[3] containing a few formal commendations of Stephen Langton, and full of "bland and suasive words," and supposing that the matter was thus satisfactorily ended, addressed another letter to the Canterbury monks, bidding them receive the archbishop obediently and give him possession of all the temporals of his See.[4] John's reply to the Pope was couched in a threatening tone. He reproached him for quashing the election of the bishop of Norwich, and for causing the election of "one Stephen Langton, a man utterly unknown to him, and who had long lived in France among his enemies and those of the State." He reminded the Pope sarcastically, that he drew

[1] *Annal. de Burton, Ann. Monast.*, i. 207.
[2] R. de Wendover, iii. 212. [3] *Ib.*, iii. 213. [4] Matt. Paris, ii. 516.

a larger revenue from England than from all the rest of the lands this side of the Alps; and he swore that if right was not done him he would utterly close the way from England to Rome, which would prevent the robbing and impoverishing of his country. "His prelates in England were sufficiently furnished with a full provision of all learning, and he had no need to go a begging to foreigners for justice and judgment."[1] The letter of John reached the Pope either just about the time that he was preparing to consecrate Stephen, or after his consecration. He replied to it in a calm tone, without, however, in the least receding from the position he had taken up. He first highly commends Stephen Langton for that very thing on which John had condemned him—namely, his sojourn in France, inasmuch as he had gained so great renown in the University of Paris. He reminds John that he is an Englishman born, and as to the king's not knowing him, he declares that he has three times written to him. Then he proceeds to touch upon the point of his having acted without the king's consent. He had, he declares, sent a message to the king by the Canterbury monks requesting that proctors might be sent by the king to give his assent to the election.[2] This message, it seems, had not been delivered, and the king had first been informed of the election by a special messenger from Rome. He had waited some time for the royal assent, though it was not absolutely necessary; but as it did not come, he had proceeded to do that which the canons ordained, and give a

[1] R. de Wendover, iii. 215; Matt. Paris, ii. 517. Compare with this the preamble of the famous Statute for Restraint of Appeals (24 Henry VIII., c. 12). "The realm of England is an empire governed by one supreme head and king, who has full power to give justice in all causes to all manner of folk, without restraint or appeal to any foreign prince or potentate, the body spiritual of the realm having power, so that when any cause of the law divine happeneth to come in question, or of spiritual learning, it was declared and interpreted by that part of the body politic called the spiritualty, now being usually called the English Church, which hath always been, and is, for knowledge, integrity, and number, sufficient to declare and determine all doubts without the intermeddling of any exterior person."

[2] This, however, was *after* the election had taken place, so that it was a mere farce.

pastor to the Lord's flock by consecrating Stephen. For this the king ought to be grateful and not to set himself up against the vicegerent of the Most High ; remembering the cause for which the blessed Thomas shed his blood, and how his father and brother, kings of England, had renounced the evil custom of nominating the Primate.[1] Stephen Langton had been already consecrated at Viterbo (June 17, 1207).

34. The king's fury now knew no bounds. The first to feel his vengeance were the unfortunate monks of Christ Church. They had sinned first of all in electing Reginald without license, and then, having elected the bishop of Norwich by way of amends, and drawn money from the Treasury for their journey to Rome to obtain his confirmation, had basely turned round and, in place of him, had elected the king's "public enemy" Stephen de Langton. As punishment for this offence the king sent Fulk de Cantilupe and William de Cornhill, "most cruel and barbarous knights," with an armed band, to drive the monks of Christ Church out of the land as guilty of treason, or, if they resisted, to slay them. The fierce soldiers entered the monastery with drawn swords, calling with furious words upon the prior and the monks that, as traitors, they should instantly quit the land, or they and their monastery should be burned together. The frightened monks fled at once, and found a refuge in Flanders. Their old rivals from St. Augustine's were invited to perform the services of the Church. Their goods were plundered by Fulk, and their lands and those of the See remained uncultured (July 15).[2] At the same time the king swore mighty oaths that Stephen Langton should never set his foot on English ground.

[1] R. de Wendover, iii. 216 ; Matt. Paris, ii. 517-520. Dr. Hook (*Lives of the Archbishops*, ii. 670) puts this letter of the Pope's *before* the consecration. But this is not consistent with its contents. He also puts the letter of John too early. Dean Milman (*Lat. Christ.*, iv. 85) supposes that John had received no letter from the Pope. But Innocent expressly says that he had written again after the letter which had been entrusted to the monks, and that this letter had been delivered to the king by his messenger : "Cursor noster apostolicas tibi literas præsentavit."—R. de Wendover, iii. 218.

[2] R. de Wendover, iii. 214 ; Matt. Paris, ii. 516 ; *Ann. Monast.*, i. 28, 58 ; ii. 80, 259 ; iii. 450 ; iv. 52, 395.

35. The Pope's reply to these menaces and acts of rage was to direct three bishops—William of London, Eustace of Ely, and Mauger of Worcester—to proceed to the king and to exhort him, with all pious persuasion, to yield to the Lord's will and accept the Primate. Then, if they found him contumacious, they were to threaten him, from the Pope, with an interdict for the whole land, and if this should fail, with still heavier punishment, inasmuch as it was necessary for Him to be victorious, who, for the salvation of His holy Church, spoiled the prison of hell.[1] The bishops performed their dangerous duty, "humbly and with many tears" exhorting the king to yield. The king broke out into furious blasphemies, swearing "by the teeth of God" that if they or any others should put his land under an interdict he would send all the clergy packing to the Pope, and confiscate all their goods. And if he could catch any Romans in his land, he would put out their eyes and cut off their noses, and send them in this plight to Rome. He bade the bishops hasten out of his presence if they valued their own safety, an advice which they thought it prudent to follow.

36. Having failed to find "the fruit of penitence" in the king, the prelates, in the following Lent, took courage to perform the task committed to them by the Pope. On the Monday after Passion Sunday, which fell that year (1208) on the 24th March,[2] they put the whole of the land under an interdict, and having done this awful and sacrilegious deed, they succeeded in effecting their escape from the country.[3]

37. What was the effect of this sentence, which a Christian bishop had pronounced on a Christian people in order to revenge himself on a king who had ventured to stand up for the immemorial rights of his crown? The chronicler tells us—"Throughout the whole of the Church of England all divine offices ceased, except only the baptism of infants, and the confession and absolution of the dying."[4]

[1] R. de Wendover, iii, 221; Matt. Paris, ii. 521.

[2] *Ann. de Waverleiâ, Ann. Monast.*, ii. 260. "In vigiliâ Annuntiationis Dominicæ."

[3] R. de Wendover, iii. 222; Matt. Paris, ii. 522; *Ann. Monast.*, ii. 260, iii. 30, iv. 396. The interdict was published on Passion Sunday, to take effect upon the following day.

[4] *Ann. de Waverleiâ, Ann. Monast.*, ii. 260.

If this were all that was permitted, fearful indeed must have been the state of the land throughout those long years during which the curse was allowed to remain. But another annalist gives a somewhat less gloomy picture. The Dunstable chronicler says—"Marriage rites and churchings were done at the door of the church, and then the Gospel was read; and on Sundays a sermon was made to the people outside the church, and there holy bread and water were given to them; the priests baptized in the churches, and, lest the chrism should fail, they were allowed by the Pope to mix oil with it, and all who desired to offer were allowed to approach the altar."[1] But while it is highly probable that the occasional offices of the Church were performed, and that even the dead sometimes received a Christian burial, there yet remained this one undoubted fact, that wherever the interdict was observed there was no consecration of the Eucharist, which, with the views held as to the nature of that sacrament, was equivalent to a shutting-up of heaven. In many parts of England "the world seemed to be surrendered to the unrestrained power of the devil and evil spirits. The intercourse between man and God was utterly broken off, souls left to perish, or but reluctantly permitted absolution at the hour of death."[2] From the miseries of the interdict one order of "religious" was by special and peculiar privilege exempt. The Cistercians, or White Monks, could celebrate their services in the midst of an interdict.[3] They at first ventured to do this in 1208, but the Pope hearing of it ordered them imperatively to desist, so that they were obliged to abandon the privilege.[4]

38. It was John's determination to make the clergy and religious, as a body, feel to the utmost extent the bitter effects of the Pope's curse. Immediately on the publication of the interdict he took vigorous measures for

[1] *Ann. de Dunstaplid*, *Ann. Monast.*, iii. 30. For the exact orders given by the Pope as to the interdict, see Notes and Illustrations to this Chapter.

[2] Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iv. 87. The Pope, in order to make the prohibition of the Eucharist more bearable, propounded the doctrine, "Crede et manducasti." See Notes and Illustrations.

[3] *Vita S. Hugonis* (ed. Dimock), 324; Dugdale, v. 283.

[4] R. de Wendover, iii. 225.

the sequestration of all the estates of those who should obey the Pope. He issued his letters-patent for the dioceses whose bishops had fled, appointing certain receivers of the ecclesiastical property.[1] At the same time he endeavoured to frighten the clergy out of the kingdom by terrible threats, the work of confiscation being more easily and effectually carried on in their absence. For the most part, however, the chief clergy, aware of this, shut themselves up in monasteries, and refused to depart except they were violently expelled. No personal violence was used towards those who did this, but they had a small allowance for sustenance out of their confiscated goods.[2] Everywhere their barns were sealed up, and all their rents brought into the Exchequer. A more atrocious and unfeeling expedient was also adopted. Great numbers of the clergy were still married. Their wives were everywhere seized, and only allowed to be redeemed by a heavy ransom. If a clerk were met by the king's officers riding on a journey, he was dragged from his horse, robbed, and ill-treated, and there was no way by which he could obtain justice. When a robber was brought before the king, charged with killing a priest, the king ordered him to be released, for, said he, "he has only slain one of my enemies." The relatives of those bishops who had ventured to pronounce the interdict were seized, mulcted of

[1] *Rot. Lit. Pat.*, p. 80. The form of the letters for the diocese of Lincoln ran as follows:—"The king to all clerks and laymen of the diocese of Lincoln, greeting. Know ye that from Monday next, before the feast of Easter, we have committed to William de Cornhill, Archdeacon of Huntingdon, and to Gerard de Caville, all the lands and property of the abbots and priors, and of all religious, and also of all clerks in the diocese of Lincoln, who shall refuse from that date to celebrate the divine offices; and we command you from that time forward to be obedient unto them as our bailiffs, and to give credit to them in those matters in which they shall advertise you in the meanwhile as to our proper selves."

[2] "Dr. Lingard, from the Close Rolls, has given what was the 'rationale estuverium' allowed, namely, two dishes a day (ad prandium) for a monk, and as much as should be judged necessary by four sworn men of the parish for a secular clergyman."—Mr. Coxe's Note, R. de Wendover, iii. 223.

all their goods, and thrown into prison.[1] These violent measures of the king no doubt intimidated many of the clergy, and caused them to disregard the interdict, and still to continue the celebration of divine offices. They thus obtained protection. There were three bishops at least —Winchester, Bath, and Norwich [2]—who remained faithful to the king, and in their dioceses the interdict was but little observed. The king was desirous to add another to their number by causing (in 1209) the election to the See of Lincoln of Archdeacon Hugh of Wells, brother to the bishop of Bath, who was serving the king; but the elect, who had been the king's vice-chancellor, and had acted for him against the Romanising clergy, being obliged to go abroad for consecration, was drawn over to the papal party, and remained in exile with the other bishops.

39. The Pope, furious at the partial failure of his curse, and at the contumacious behaviour of John, prepared to take still more violent measures. Hitherto he had only punished the king's innocent subjects for a fault in their ruler which they had no means whatever of mending. Now he at last bethought him of punishing the offender himself. But John, anticipating his excommunication, and probably his deposition so far as the Pope could effect it, took precautionary measures. He seized a number of hostages from the families of his chief nobles to secure their allegiance. He showed no relaxation of his ferocious temper towards the clergy, but rather increased it. At Oxford, where a woman had been murdered by a clerk, who had escaped, the king caused, without a shadow of justice, three clerks who belonged to the same hall as the criminal to be hanged in his stead. At this gross outrage the university was

[1] *Ann. de Waverleiâ*, *Ann. Monast.*, ii. 260; R. de Wendover, iii. 223; Matt. Paris, ii. 523. The chronicler adds that "the bishops stayed comfortably beyond seas, living in every comfort, not putting themselves forward like a wall before the house of God."

[2] See *Political Songs* (Camd. Soc.), where a violent attack is made upon these three bishops. Bath is satirised for his addiction to secular business, and called "Doctus in Decalogo, cæcus in formâ canonis." Norwich is stigmatised as "Norwicensis bestia;" and Winchester as "ad computandum impiger, piger in Evangelium."—*Political Songs* (Wright), pp. 10-12.

broken up, and the students retired, some to Cambridge, some to Reading, leaving Oxford deserted.[1] The interdict had continued for the greater part of two years before the special excommunication of the King himself was spoken. It was signified by the Pope to the three bishops of London, Ely, and Worcester, and they were ordered to take measures for publishing it in England. The churches of the monasteries had now, by the intercession of Stephen Langton, been allowed by the Pope to have divine service, and the celebration of the Eucharist, once a week.[2] It was ordered that the excommunication should be published in these churches during the time of mass. The three bishops entrusted with this difficult duty thought that they had discharged it by sending word to some of their brethren in England that it was to be done. But in England, so great was the terror of the king's vengeance, no one was found hardy enough thus to devote himself to certain destruction. The sentence therefore remained unpublished. But it was known that it had been spoken,[3] and men began to talk secretly about it, one with another. An unfortunate clerk, Geoffrey, archdeacon of Norwich, thought himself obliged to leave his place in the king's Exchequer because of the sentence. He was seized and thrown into prison, tortured, and starved to death.[4] The Pope was as yet quite unable to tame this savage king, and it is probable that he would not have succeeded finally had it not been for the deep hatred which John's evil conduct had excited in his subjects. At the Christmas season of 1209-10, John was at Windsor, and all the magnates of the kingdom attended his council, and communicated with him in spite of the excommunication, which was well known to have been spoken. Some abortive attempts had been made at reconciliation. Archbishop Langton had even crossed over to Dover under a safe-conduct, but he had not seen the king. The principal difficulty between the king and the bishops seemed to be one of money.[5] John, on the failure of these negotiations,

[1] R. de Wendover, iii. 227; Matt. Paris, ii. 526.
[2] R. de Wendover, iii. 226.
[3] *Ib.*, iii. 229.
[4] *Ib.*, iii. 229; Matt. Paris, ii. 527.
[5] *Ann. de Waverleid*, *Ann. Monast.*, ii. 263.

applied himself to the congenial work of torturing the Jews to exact money, and pillaging the Cistercian monasteries. From the whole order of the White Monks he is said to have extracted the sum of 33,300 marks,[1] though it is hard to understand how this could be if the king had already their estates in sequestration. His expeditions against Ireland and Wales were singularly fortunate, and he was in no specially yielding frame of mind when at Northampton, on the festival of the Assumption, he received the Pope's messengers, Pandulf, the sub-deacon, a trusted agent of Innocent, and Durand, a Templar.

40. Of this interview between John and Pandulf a very graphic account is preserved in the Burton Annals.[2] The king argues strenuously for his right as sovereign of England. Pandulf replies that his predecessors had surrendered these rights, as notably his father Henry II. in the matter of Archbishop Richard. John replies, "He could not bind his successors." "But you have sworn to observe the customs of your ancestors," said Pandulf. John was silent, but he had already pointed out that there were abundance of precedents on the other side. John offers to accept any other archbishop from the Pope if he will give up Stephen. Pandulf refuses this. He then proceeds to threaten. The king says contemptuously, "Can you do any more harm than mere words?" "You are already excommunicated. The promulgation of the sentence only stays till my return." "What then?" "We shall absolve all those who have not communicated with you; and those who have done so will be excommunicated." "What then?" "We shall absolve all your subjects from their allegiance, and send an army into England to dethrone you." "What more can you do?" "Neither you nor any of your heirs can ever be crowned." "By the Almighty Ruler," said the king, "if you had not had my special command to come here, you and yours should be made to ride upon nothing."[3] "I know my danger," said the bold envoy; "but I am ready to suffer death for the Church

[1] *Ann. de Waverleiâ, Ann. Monast.*, ii. 263.

[2] See *Ann. Monast.*, i. 207, *sq.*, and ii. 268, *sq.*

[3] *Equitare* is the expression used.

of God." John then caused a number of his prisoners to be brought forth, and exhibited their various punishments and tortures to Pandulf. He bore the sight stoically, but when a clerk was about to be hanged, roused to energy on behalf of holy Church, he rushed out to get a candle that he might excommunicate the executioners.[1] Upon this the king made him a present of the clerk.

41. Pandulf's mission having failed, and interdict and excommunication having proved alike inoperative, the archbishop and bishops repaired to Rome to press for stronger measures. The Pope then formally pronounced John's deposition, and sent Pandulf into France to make Philip II. the offer of the crown.[2] Against this pressing danger John's energetic preparations seemed to promise every probability of success, when suddenly the king's heart almost failed him. He knew that he had bitterly angered his nobles.[3] He knew that the power of the king of France was great, and his hatred of himself intense. But above all, his mind, superstitious though unbelieving, was possessed with a vague terror by a prophecy which foretold that he should not be king of England after Ascension Day. When Pandulf therefore appeared again on the scene, and exhorted him to yield, he declared himself ready to submit to the Pope. Part of the terms of course were that the archbishop and bishops in exile should be received back,[4] that the Canterbury monks should be restored, and all other exiled clerks. The king bound himself to give peaceable restitution to the ecclesiastics, under penalty, if he did otherwise, of forfeiting all his rights of patronage to the Pope. He promised a full restitution of all goods plundered from the Church, eight thousand pounds to be paid down on the coming of the person commissioned to absolve him, and the rest to be assessed afterwards. He promised to liberate all the clerks whom he had in prison, to take off

[1] Pandulf, as a sub-deacon, could not have had the power of validly excommunicating.

[2] R. de Wendover, iii. 241.

[3] Tot fere habuit hostes quot magnates.—Wendover.

[4] These were Archbishop Stephen Langton; William, bishop of London; Eustace, bishop of Ely; Giles, bishop of Hereford; Jocelin, bishop of Wells; Hugh, bishop of Lincoln.

all outlawries, to restore their goods, all which things being rightly performed, it was promised that the interdict should be removed.[1]

42. But this was not all. John, now in a state of abject terror, would be contented with nothing less than formally surrendering his crown and realm into the hands of the Pope. His charter of resignation declared that he had grievously offended God, and desiring to humble himself before Him, not through fear of man, he gave of his own free will to God, St. Peter and St. Paul, and the holy Church of Rome, the whole kingdom of England and the whole kingdom of Ireland, for the remission of his sins ; and receiving them again at the hands of the Pope to hold as his feudatory, he swore fidelity to the Pope, and promised to do homage to him, binding his successors for ever to this, and promising as tribute, in addition to Peter's Pence, a payment of 1000 marks at Michaelmas.[2] A form of homage was then drawn up which ran as follows, "I, John, etc., from this time forward will be faithful to God, St. Peter, and the Church of Rome, and to my lord the Pope, the lord Innocent, and his Catholic successors. I will not consent or counsel either by words or deeds that they shall lose life, limb, or liberty. Their damage I will hinder, and will make them to know of. I will keep their counsels secret, and reveal nothing to their hurt. The patrimony of St. Peter, and specially the kingdoms of England and Ireland, I will to my power defend against all men. So help me God and the Holy Gospels."[3] Thus this king, who had in so many ways disgraced the throne of England, consummated the baseness of his reign by this final degradation. The prediction of Peter of Wakefield had been abundantly fulfilled, and John had indeed ceased to be king of England before Ascension Day. But as he was still alive and still able to do evil deeds, the unfortunate prophet and his son were drawn at horses' feet, and their bodies afterwards hanged, while the self-dethroned king gloried in his revenge.[4]

43. As the barons showed a decided repugnance to

[1] R. de Wendover, iii. 248 ; Matt. Paris, ii. 541-544.
[2] R. de Wendover, iii. 254 ; Matt. Paris, ii. 545 (May 15, 1213).
[3] R. de Wendover, iii. 254 ; Matt. Paris, ii. 546.
[4] R. de Wendover, iii. 255.

following John in the attack he meditated upon Philip, and alleged as the reason of this that John was still excommunicated, and as John could not be released till the bishops returned, it was necessary to bring them back as quickly as possible. They were unwilling to return until they had the undertaking of twenty-four nobles, as well as that of the king, that they should be unmolested. This being obtained, they landed at Dover on the 16th July 1213, and on the 20th reached Winchester, where the king was. The king came to meet them, and on "seeing the archbishop and the bishops, fell prostrate on the earth at their feet, beseeching them with tears to have pity on him and on the realm of England. The archbishop and bishops with many tears raised the king up, conducting him on the right hand and the left to the door of the Cathedral, where, after reciting the 51st Psalm in the sight of all the magnates, freely weeping for joy, they absolved him as holy Church ordains."[1] The absolution took place in the chapter-house. The king swore that he would cherish and defend holy Church, that he would bring back the good laws of King Edward, that he would judge justly and give to all their rights, that he would make full restitution of all wrongs done under the interdict before Easter next. He swore fidelity to Pope Innocent and his successors. Then the archbishop leading him into the Church celebrated mass, and after mass they feasted together royally. On the morrow the king sent letters to the sheriffs, ordering them to cause four competent men with a president to be chosen from each town to assemble at St. Alban's in August to assess the damages suffered by the clergy from the seizures made of their goods during the interdict.[2] The Roman party had thus obtained a complete triumph. The king, once so bold and defiant, now held his crown and place simply as the deputy of Rome. The archbishop, proscribed and threatened with hanging, was now the most important person in the country. Happily for England, he knew how to use his power better than his patron Innocent, and by his admirable conduct and firmness earned for himself one of the highest niches among the worthies of England.

[1] R. de Wendover, iii. 260 ; Matt. Paris, ii. 550.

[2] Matt. Paris, ii. 550.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

POPE INNOCENT'S DIRECTIONS AS TO THE WAY IN WHICH THE INTERDICT WAS TO BE OBSERVED IN ENGLAND.

[Letter to the three bishops who pronounced the sentence.] "Vestris consultationibus respondemus quod cum occasione Interdicti novum chrisma in Cœnâ Domini nequeat consecrari, veteri utendum est in baptismate parvulorum, et, si necessitas postulaverit, ipsi chrismati, ne deficiat, est oleum commiscendum per manum pontificis, aut etiam sacerdotis. Quamvis autem viaticum pertinere videatur ad pœnitentias morientium, si tamen haberi non possit, illud in hoc casu 'qui legimus credimus' obtinere—'crede et manducasti;' quum sacramentum necessitatis articulus, sed non contemptus religionis excludat, ipsaque necessitas in proximo speretur defutura. Nec evangelium nec horæ ecclesiasticæ celebrentur in loco solemni sive alio, populo ibidem conveniente. Viri religiosi quorum monasteria causâ religionis visitare consueverunt, non per majus ostium sed per secretiorem locum peregrinos intra ecclesiam admittant ad orationem. Ostia ecclesiarum clausa permaneant præterquam in præcipuo festo ecclesiæ, quando apertis ostiis parochiani et alii admitti poterunt in ecclesiam ad orandum. Baptismus intra ecclesiam ostiis clausis modo consueto cum veteri chrismate et oleo celebretur, nullâ laicâ personâ præter patrinos admissâ, et si necessitas postulaverit est oleum novum commiscendum. Pœnitentia tam sano quam ægroto est infligenda, quia mediâ vitâ in morte sumus. Confessi in jure vel convicti super aliquo crimine ad episcopum vel ejus pœnitentialem sunt transmittendi, et si necessitas fuerit ad hoc per ecclesiasticam censuram sunt compellendi. Presbyteri suas horas et orationes privatim dicere possunt. Presbyteri die dominicâ aquam possunt in cœmiterio benedicere et aspergere, panemque benedictum facere et tribuere, et festivitates et jejunia denunciare, sermonem facere ad populum. Mulier enixa veniat ad ecclesiam et extra parietes ecclesiæ suam faciat purificationem. Presbyteri infirmos visitabunt, confessiones audient, animarum commendationem modo consueto celebrent, cadavera mortuorum quia ecclesiasticâ carebunt sepultuâ non sequentur. Presbyteri die Passionis sive solemnitate crucem extra ecclesiam ponent, et parochiani ipsam consuetâ devotione adorent."—Wilkins, *Concil.*, i. 526, ex MSS. Cotton., Cleopatra E. 1, fol. 143.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE BEGINNING OF THE REACTION AGAINST ROME.

1213-1253.

1. The Primate restrains John's vindictive projects. 2. He publishes the charter of Henry I. 3. Compensation to the Church offered by John. 4. The Legate, in the King's interest, oppresses the clergy. 5. The Archbishop strives to resist his oppressions. 6. The interdict removed. 7. Archbishop Langton's provision for the Church in the Great Charter. 8. The Archbishop suspended by the Pope. 9. Ill-treatment of the clergy by Pope and King. 10. The oppressions continue under the new king. 11. Translation of St. Thomas. 12. Council of Oxford; vicarages. 13. The friars in England. 14. The Pope's demand for prebends and monks' portions rejected. 15. The Pope appoints the English Primate. 16. Money exacted from the clergy; the Caursins. 17. Riotous proceedings against the Roman clergy in England; the "Lewythiel." 18. The Pope forces Edmund Rich on the English Church as Primate. 19. Visitation of monasteries. 20. Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln. 21. Melancholy state of the Church. 22. Coming of the Legate Otho. 23. Council of London. 24. Excitement caused by proceedings of Legate. 25. Resistance of the clergy to demands upon them; remonstrances of the barons. 26. The Roman exactions overwhelm the archbishop. 27. Resistance of the clergy; departure of the Legate. 28. Boniface of Savoy elected Archbishop of Canterbury. 29. The clergy protest against Papal exactions. 30. The exactions nevertheless continue. 31. Grosseteste becomes tax-gatherer for the Pope. 32. Vigorous but ineffectual resistance. 33. Effect of the exactions on the principles of the clergy. 34. Bishop Grosseteste's sermon at Lyons. 35. His energetic efforts at reformation. 36. The Pope intrudes his nephew into a prebend at Lincoln. 37. Grosseteste's letter refusing to admit him. 38. His appeal to the English people to protect the National Church. 39. His dying testimony against the Papal policy.

1. JOHN had reconciled himself to the Church by a dastardly prostration, but he had by no means reconciled himself to his barons. The quarrel which these had against him did not arise from his ecclesiastical position, nor was it satisfied by his humiliation before the Pope and the bishops. In the midst of that humiliation the king was

meditating projects of vengeance, and counting upon his absolution as a means for facilitating his schemes. In his calculations, however, he had left out of consideration the noble and intrepid character of the archbishop. Stephen Langton boldly opposed the king's preparations for war, told him that by attacking any one he would forfeit the benefits of his absolution, threatened, without regard to the king's furious anger, to excommunicate any who joined with him, and thus brought the savage monarch, in spite of himself, to forego his intended violence. The Interdict was not yet removed. It might be indefinitely prolonged if the king should again put himself in the wrong. Thus peace was for the moment secured.[1]

2. But it was the object of the archbishop to put the security of the subject on a firmer basis than was furnished by the temporary fears or necessities of the king. At a council held at St. Paul's, London, August 25 (1213), at which the bishops, abbots, priors, deans, as well as the barons, were present, after a modified relaxation of the Interdict had been conceded,[2] the archbishop addressed the assembly, reminding them that the king had promised, when absolved at Winchester, to uphold the good laws of King Edward, and announcing that a charter, granted by Henry I., had been found reciting these good laws, and giving a statement of the liberties and privileges that they might claim under them. The charter was then read to the council. It contained all the chief provisions afterwards embodied in its more famous successor, and in particular, it covenanted that the Church should be free, that no church should be sold or put out to farm by the king, that the king should take nothing from a vacant See or abbey, but reserve its revenues until a successor should be appointed. This was to go behind the Constitutions of Clarendon, which allowed the king to retain the revenues of vacant Church preferments, and was therefore much more favourable to the Church. Its other provisions were so manifestly favour-

[1] R. de Wendover, iii. 262.

[2] "Archiepiscopus indulsit tam ecclesiis conventualibus quam presbyteris sæcularibus ut horas canonicas in ecclesiis suis, audientibus parochianis, suppressâ voce cantarent."—Wendover.

able to the barons and the nation, that "the barons hearing it, rejoiced with exceeding great joy, and swore in the presence of the archbishop that for these liberties they would contend if necessary even to the death."[1] Thus had the Church stepped forward to be the leader in asserting the privileges of the nation. The idea of referring to the laws of Henry I., as the standard of the liberties of the subject, had first been mooted at the assembly held at St. Albans on August 4, to assess the amount of damage due to the Church from the oppressions used against it during the Interdict.[2] Having thus obtained a knowledge of this charter, the archbishop was resolved not to allow it to sleep. Its publication by his direction in the council of St. Paul's may be regarded as one of the epochs in the history both of Church and State in England.

3. While the foundation was thus being laid for independent action, the king, on his part, was busy in completing his alliance with the Pope. The Legate Nicholas arrived about Michaelmas, and at a council held in London the king offered to pay down 100,000 marks as a compensation to the bishops for the moneys taken from their Sees, and to promise to make good before Easter whatever further sum should be assessed against him. The bishops, however, were suspicious of this offer. They thought probably that the king having once made a payment and obtained the release of the Interdict, it would be hard to get him to repeat the process. They desired that a more full inquiry should be instituted as to the claims of the Church, and John, willing enough to be saved the present expenditure, readily assented.

4. It was evidently the policy of the king to use his favour with the Pope and the Legate as against the clergy

[1] R. de Wendover, iii. 266.

[2] Matt. Paris, *Hist. Maj.*, p. 239 (ed. Wats). This council at St. Alban's was attended by representatives from each shire, and is regarded by Mr. Stubbs as of the highest historical importance. "To the first representative assembly on record is submitted the first draught of the reforms afterwards embodied in the charter; the action of the council is the first hesitating and tentative step towards that great act in which Church, baronage, and people, make their constitutional pact with the king."—*Const. Hist.*, i. 527.

and their claims. He did not shrink from again formally resigning his crown, solemnly before the altar at St. Paul's Church, and giving again to the Pope's representative the charter of subjection sealed with gold; expecting, doubtless, to obtain for this renewed and more formal abasement an equivalent in the attitude of the Legate towards the clergy. And in this way he certainly was paid; for at Reading, a few days afterwards, where by appointment the clergy were to hand in their claims for compensation, the Legate decided that there need be no immediate payment of any claims; except that the bishops, who had been abroad and were newly returned, should receive 15,000 marks between them.[1] The disappointed clergy, in the cases of most of whom the money claim did not represent anything like their real losses—whose buildings had been thrown down, orchards and woods destroyed—were full of indignation against the Legate, who, far from helping them, actually stood in their way. This indignation was greatly increased when, on receiving a direction from the Pope to see to the filling up of the vacant churches, the Legate proceeded, without taking counsel with the bishops or with any one fit to advise him, to give away the preferments haphazard to any clerks of the king, or others who might recommend themselves to him; heaping preferments on such clerks, utterly regardless of the rights of the patrons, and treating the Church of England as a completely subject Church with more than even Roman pride and injustice.[2]

5. Doubtless the king looked on well pleased to see the clergy whom he hated oppressed by the power which they had invoked against him, but which he was now using against them. But the archbishop was not of the disposition to submit calmly to such injustice. Calling a meeting of his suffragans at Dunstable about Epiphany (1214), the grievous injury done to the Church by these uncanonical intrusions was discussed, and the Archbishop decided to appeal to Rome against the proceedings of the Legate. He despatched, accordingly, two of his clerks to him at Burton-upon-Trent, where he was then staying, to

[1] R. de Wendover, iii. 276; *Ann. de Waverleiâ*, *Ann. Monast.*, ii. 278.

[2] R. de Wendover, iii. 278.

inform him of his appeal, and to inhibit him from making any more appointments to churches or abbeys. The Legate took no notice of the prohibition, but immediately sent Pandulf, who was with him, to make good his cause with the Pope. This clever and unscrupulous person, on arriving at Rome, blackened with all zeal the character of the archbishop, while he extolled the king with the greatest praise. It was in vain that Simon de Langton, the brother of the archbishop, contended against these false representations. The sight of the charter of subjection, with its golden seals, exhibited by Pandulf, was too strong an argument against him. Pandulf freely asserted that the demands of the archbishop and bishops on account of their losses during the Interdict were excessive, so that the cause of the English prelates was only injured instead of advanced.[1] The Pope finally determined that the amount to be paid by the king to the bishops, whose revenues he had seized during the Interdict, should be 40,000 marks, to be paid at the rate of 12,000 annually. Upon receiving this bull the Legate summoned another council at St. Paul's, and, having ascertained that the said bishops and the Canterbury monks had already received 27,000 marks, he caused security to be given to them for the payment of the remaining 13,000.[2] Thus, instead of obtaining more than the 100,000 marks at first offered to them, the bishops were obliged to content themselves with a far smaller sum. But the hardest case was that of the other clergy who had stayed in England, but whose rents had been seized and goods pillaged by the king. For these there was no redress. The Legate told them coldly that they were not mentioned in the Pope's letter, and although they eagerly appealed to the Papal Court, he absolutely refused to allow them any portion of their claim to enable them to go and lay their cause before the Pope. Truly the king was well paid for his base subserviency to the Pope, while the spirited conduct of the archbishop involved him and the bishops who supported him in no small losses.[3]

6. At length, some sort of settlement of the money difficulty having been made, the Legate, armed with the

[1] R. de Wendover, iii. 278. [2] *Ib.*, 284. [3] *Ib.*, 285.

Pope's authority, on the day of St. Peter and St. Paul, (June 29, 1214), solemnly, in the cathedral of St. Paul, declared the Interdict removed, amidst the rejoicings of the people and the singing of Te Deum. It had oppressed the land, and vexed the Church of England, for the space of six years three months and fourteen days.[1] The chief gainer by it was the king, whom it was intended to coerce; the chief sufferers were those clergy who were loyal to the Pope, whose interests were betrayed by the Legate, desirous in all things to favour the king who had so humiliated himself to the Papal See.

7. The barons now began to press for the ratification of the "good laws" which the king at Winchester had sworn to establish, and for the substance of these laws they put forward the charter of Henry I., which the archbishop had caused to be read publicly at St. Paul's. The King shifted and prevaricated, sought help from his ally the Pope, took the vow of the Crusade to give himself a sacred character, tried to detach the clergy from the barons, and raged violently against the archbishop, who acted as the emissary of the barons to explain their demands.[2] When, however, the barons marched to London, and were joined eagerly by the citizens of the capital, and John's adherents became fewer and fewer, the king was compelled at length to accept the Great Charter, which was solemnly ratified at Runnymede, June 15, 1215. The nation owed a vast debt of gratitude to the clergy, both for efficient aid in obtaining this treaty of liberties and for the skilfully worded provisions which secured those liberties.[3] The acuteness and firmness of Archbishop Langton deserve the highest admiration. He saw through the attempt made by the King and the Pope to separate the cause of the clergy from that of the barons, by offering to the clergy, first as from the King himself, and then from the King ratified by the Pope,[4] a charter of eccle-

[1] R. de Wendover, iii. 284. But if the Interdict began March 24, 1208, its duration was six years three months and five days. The *Waverley Annals* put the remission of the Interdict on July 2, the *Dunstable Annals* on July 3.—*Ann. Monast.*, ii. 281; iii. 43.

[2] R. de Wendover, iii. 298. [3] See Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, i. 531.

[4] Issued first, November 21, 1214; secondly, January 15, 1215.

siastical liberties which might easily have been accepted by one less able or more selfish. This charter declared that elections to Sees and abbacies should be absolutely free; but it contained a qualifying clause, "Salvâ nobis et hæredibus nostris custodiâ ecclesiarum et monasteriorum vacantium quæ ad nos pertinent."[1] Now, by the twelfth Constitution of Clarendon it had been enacted, "Cum vacaverit archiepiscopatus vel episcopatus vel abbatia vel prioratus de dominio regis, debet esse in manu ipsius, et inde percipiet omnes reditus et exitus sicut dominicos."[2] It is therefore probable that the qualifying clause in the ecclesiastical charter was meant to retain this royal right; but the charter of Henry I., which the archbishop had published, spoke very differently. Its words were—"Sanctam Dei ecclesiam imprimis liberam facio, ita quod nec vendam nec ad firmam ponam, nec mortuo archiepiscopo sive episcopo sive abbate aliquid accipiam de dominio ecclesiæ, vel de hominibus ejus, donec successor in eam ingrediatur."[3] The archbishop did not consider that the concession here made was sufficiently expressed in the ecclesiastical charter, and he accordingly procured a more distinct enunciation of it to be inserted in the Great Charter. This provides, "Quod Anglicana ecclesia libera sit, et habeat jura sua integra, et libertates suas illæsas; et libertatem electionum, quæ maxima et magis necessaria reputatur ecclesiæ Anglicanæ nos observabimus, et ab heredibus nostris in perpetuum bonâ fide volumus observari."[4] It is true that these words do not contain, as distinctly as those of Henry's charter, the provision about the vacant preferments; but, on the other hand, they do not contain the qualifying clause recognising the king's rights, and the expression "jura sua integra" seems to give a full margin for the Church to claim this right of keeping its revenues from the royal grasp.

8. The evil king, having been compelled to grant justice and liberty to his subjects, at once set himself to endeavour to overthrow and retract what he had just before solemnly conceded. With a view to this he applied to his suzerain, the Pope, desiring to obtain a dispensation from his promises. At Rome such dispensations have always been

[1] Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 280.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 133.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 97.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 288.

easily procurable when they suited the policy of the Pope. Innocent absolved John from his promises, annulled Magna Charta, and when the barons refused to surrender their hard-won gains, excommunicated them—first generally, and afterwards by name.[1] The king, who went raging through the country, attended by bands of cut-throat mercenaries, acting like a fiend in human shape in his rapine and cruelty, was his "beloved son in Christ," and the archbishop and the bishops were severely rated for encouraging resistance against so holy a person. "In what a fashion do you bishops defend the patrimony of the Roman Church! Where is your support of those who have assumed the Cross? Where is your opposition to those who strive to destroy the image of the crucified? Ye are worse than the Saracens, inasmuch as ye try to drive from his kingdom one of whom there was good hope that he would succour the Holy Land."[2] The archbishop and bishops are bid to publish everywhere the sentence of excommunication against the barons. This order the noble-hearted Primate refused to obey. With him were all the bishops except Peter de Roches, bishop of Winchester, a foreigner, who was acting as chancellor; and Walter Gray, bishop of Hereford, an illiterate man, who was scheming to obtain the archbishopric of York. That the Primate should venture to take this stand against both Pope and King shows the calm courage which possessed him, and raises him high in the scale of great English prelates. The Pope was furiously indignant, and ordered his suspension to be pronounced. It was pronounced just as he was setting foot on board to attend the Lateran Council.[3] It was afterwards approved and ratified at Rome.[4] The mean revenge was also taken against him of not allowing his brother Simon, though elected by the York chapter, to succeed to the See.

9. The horrors which England suffered during the last year of the reign of John, and which more than justified

[1] R. de Wendover, iii. 322, 323, 336, 353. [2] *Ib.*, iii. 337.

[3] *Ib.*, iii. 340.

[4] *Ib.*, p. 345. The suspension was afterwards taken off on his undertaking not to return to England until the king and the barons were reconciled.—Wendover, iii. 366.

the appeal to the French prince, have probably never been surpassed. The clergy are said to have been especially sufferers, as their sympathy with the barons was well known, though their fear of pope and king, and the absence of their leader, hindered them from taking an open part. "The priests, standing at the very altars, holding the emblem of the cross of the Lord in their hands, shining in their sacred vestments, were continually seized, tortured, robbed, wounded; nor was there bishop, priest, or Levite present to pour oil or wine into their wounds."[1] Yet these proceedings were upheld by the Pope, and by the Legate, who further occupied himself in making some special exactions for his own peculiar profit.[2] Matthew Paris might well make the oppressed people of England exclaim—"Woe to thee, John! last of kings, abomination of the nobles of England; thou of sad memory for all future ages, like the tail of the serpent which draws half of the stars from heaven! Thou wert free, but thou hast made thyself a vassal of slavery, and hast involved thy most noble land with thee in the charter of slavery! And what of thee, O Pope! who oughtest to shine as an example to the whole world as the father of sanctity, the glass of piety, the defender of justice, the guardian of truth—dost thou defend such an one, that in the gulf of Roman avarice all things may be sunk? Thy doings and thine excuses for them are thine accusation before God."[3] The death of the evil king at Newark (October 19, 1216) caused a momentary feeling of relief throughout the land.

10. But though the evil king was dead, the effects of his mischievous policy remained. The new king was a young boy. The French seemed to be firmly established in the land, and were not willing to forego the opportunity which they appeared to possess of subjugating it. The Pope, who had inflicted such miseries upon England, had died before the wicked king whom he supported, but men could see no probability of his policy being reversed. The archbishop was absent. The Church lay prostrate, spoiled, pillaged, and oppressed; its interests seemed to be the last

[1] R. de Wendover, iii. 351. [2] *Ib.*, iii. 379.
[3] Matt. Paris, *Hist. Maj.*, p. 278 (ed. Wats).

thing thought of. William Marshall, Earl of Pembroke, was appointed guardian of the king and the realm, and with him were associated the Legate, and Peter des Roches, bishop of Winchester. The Great Charter was re-issued. All men of influence flocked to the national side. The defeat of Louis and the French soon followed. A treaty made at Lambeth (September 11, 1217) provided an amnesty for those who had taken part with the French. Only the clergy who had supported the barons against the King and the Pope were left to the tender mercies of the Legate.[1] Many of these were deposed from their benefices;[2] many were heavily fined. The bishop of Lincoln, who was abroad, had to pay a fine of 1000 marks to the Pope, and 100 to the Legate, before he was allowed to return to his diocese. The churches had everywhere been miserably plundered; in the eastern counties, in Cambridgeshire, in Lincolnshire, the spoliation was excessive. After the great victory over the French in Lincoln, the churches were treated as though they were under a curse, and robbed without scruple. The cathedral church, then still unfinished, did not escape; and the precentor, Geoffrey of Deeping, is said to have lost 11,000 marks of moneys belonging to the Church.[3]

11. It was some consolation to the clergy to have their minds drawn off from the sad and troubled state of affairs which oppressed them, by reviving the memories of the great Churchmen who had gone to their rest. This was the era of several important "translations." In 1218 the remains of the famous English bishop Wulfstan, than whom no man deserved better the honour of sainthood, were translated, with all solemnity and pomp, into the new cathedral church of Worcester, which was consecrated the same day (June 16), in the presence of the juvenile king and a large body of the nobility, by Silvester, bishop of Worcester, assisted by ten other prelates, seventeen abbots of important monasteries, many others of lesser note, and a large body of clergy.[4] Two years later (1220), the canonisation of Hugh of Lincoln was decreed by the Pope, and his remains

[1] *Ann. de Dunstaplid, Ann. Monast.*, iii 51. [2] *Ib.*
[3] R. de Wendover, iv. 25.
[4] *Ann. de Wigorn., Ann. Monast.*, iv. 409.

were translated from his first tomb before the altar of St. John the Baptist, to a place more convenient for the accommodation of the large crowds of worshippers in the enlarged chapel.[1] But both these events were thrown into the shade by the more magnificent ceremony of the translation of St. Thomas of Canterbury, which took place July 7, 1220. Archbishop Stephen Langton had returned in May, and had been enthusiastically received. Having fixed the day for the august ceremony of the translation of the popular martyr, he proceeded to make energetic preparations for it. He borrowed large sums of money, and with them he erected a temporary palace to accommodate the guests, a palace of so fair and beautiful an appearance that, says the chronicler, "we believe that none such was ever seen since the days of Solomon."[2] At the ceremony were present twenty-four archbishops and bishops, English and foreign. The Archbishop of Rheims said high mass, and he also had dedicated on the previous day the altar erected before the new shrine. This shrine was supported on stonework about six feet high —a gorgeous work of gold and silver and precious stones.[3] To this shrine the iron coffin containing the bones of the saint was solemnly borne, in the presence of the young king and all the notables of the land. A feast followed, so magnificent in its viands and liquors, and so splendidly served with vessels of gold and silver and precious hangings, that such was never seen since the days of King Ahasuerus.[4] The archbishop published an indulgence of two years to all who should visit the shrine within the next fourteen days. In the following year he set forth a sermon or tractate on the translation, from the tone of which it may be inferred that a good deal of uproarious revelry took place at the great festival.[5]

12. Having thus done sufficient honour to the memory of his great predecessor, the archbishop applied his atten-

[1] R. de Wendover, iv. 64; *Chronicon Thomæ Wykes*, *Ann. Monast.*, iv. 61. A second and more magnificent *translation* of St. Hugh took place in 1280, when his shrine was erected in the Angels' Choir then newly constructed. [2] *Ann. de Dunstaplid*, *Ann. Monast.*, iii. 58.

[3] Hook's *Lives of Archbishops*, ii. 746. [4] *Ann. de Dunstaplid*, *u. s.*

[5] Printed in Giles's *Vitæ St. Thomæ*, ii. 269.

tion to the reformation of the many scandals and defects existing in the National Church. At an important council summoned at Oxford in the year 1222, a large number of canons or constitutions were passed, regulating in a very minute way the duties of the clergy and the fittings of the churches, and thus providing for the restoration of decent and reverent worship.[1] One of the most important matters touched by these Constitutions was the regulation of vicarages. These had been, by a wholesome enactment of the third Lateran Council (1215), ordered to be erected in all churches held by monasteries, that the people might not be dependent on the chance ministrations of one of the monks, but might have a pastor of their own, paid from their own tithes and offerings. Some of the bishops had already begun to act vigorously in this matter. Thus under the year 1220, we have, in the Annals of Dunstable Priory, an account of five vicarages settled in the churches belonging to the monastery, by Hugh de Wells, bishop of Lincoln.[2] The value of all these vicarages is about five marks each, as settled by the Oxford Council. The proportion which the vicar's stipend bears to the whole revenues of the Church is about one-third. The curious constitution enacted by the council, that priests are not to keep concubines *openly* in their parsonages, nor to visit them *openly*, is not to be interpreted as giving permission to them to do this privately, but seems to imply a general prevalence of clerical matrimony; the most that is now aimed at being that scandal may be avoided. A further recognition of the marriage of the clergy took place in 1225, when a canon was published allowing the wives of clergy to be admitted to the sacraments of the Church, if they expressed penitence.[3]

13. While the archbishop was endeavouring to reform the sadly disturbed Church of England by councils and constitutions, another agency of a more efficient character was at work to infuse new energy into it, and to heal some of the wounds which it had received. The beginning of

[1] An abstract of the Constitutions of the Council of Oxford will be found in Notes and Illustrations to this Chapter.

[2] *Ann. de Dunstaplia, Ann. Monast.*, iii. 59.

[3] R. de Wendover, iv. 104.

the thirteenth century is remarkable for the appearance of a new power in the Church, which, wisely utilised by the talent of Pope Innocent III., did very much for its help and profit. Dominic, a noble Spaniard, and Francis, son of a merchant at Assisi, struck by the miserable condition in which Christians were living, the almost entire failure of instruction from the clergy, and the neglected state of the poor and suffering, nearly coincidently projected two great schemes of missionary enterprise. The former sought to heal the wounds of the Church by establishing a great order of preachers; the latter, by organising a staff of devoted workers, who should penetrate among the sick and suffering, and bring help to their bodily wants. A wonderful success attended both efforts. The preaching brothers, Dominicans or Black Friars, were soon welcomed as Christian orators throughout the Christian world. The Minorite brethren (less than the least), also known as Franciscans and Grey Friars, everywhere carried the tenderest offices of charity and love. Devoted to poverty, not allowed to erect any but the meanest buildings, nor even to possess books, these orders in their first enthusiasm worked a revival in Christendom. Many men of the noblest blood joined them, and while the monks in their splendid monasteries, living merely for themselves, were regarded with jealousy or contempt, the friars were welcomed everywhere as the benefactors of their fellow-creatures. The Dominicans appear to have reached England about 1219, and the Franciscans about five years later.[1] They landed at Dover, being nine in number, and soon obtained settlements in London, Oxford, Cambridge, Northampton, and Lincoln. They quickly became one of the chief powers in the Church of England. Other orders followed the two first and most famous, of which the Austins and Carmelites were the chief. But the direction given to these bodies by their first founders was not followed up. The Franciscans, though ordered not to possess books, became famous for their learning.

[1] A full and most interesting account of their arrival and early labours is contained in a tract by Thomas Eccleston, *De Adventu Minorum*, which has been published with an admirable introductory sketch by Mr. Brewer (Rolls Series).

They were preachers also, like the Dominicans. All the orders, enriched by the alms of the faithful, soon began to erect costly buildings and to possess estates. They rudely interfered with the work of the parish priest, and often quite carried away his people from him by their greater popularity both for sermons and confessions. Leaning directly upon Rome, and always sure of support there, they feared not to enter the lists against bishops, priests, or even monks, with which latter they were generally on very bad terms. Eventually they became the most powerful agency for denationalising the Church of England, and upholding the tyranny of Rome. But the grievous corruption which overwhelmed them—their devotion to money-getting even by the most discreditable means—contributed, in the end, to aid powerfully the reaction against their great supporter the Pope.[1]

14. The year 1226 is notable in English Church history as having witnessed the first systematic attempt of the Pope to use the benefices of the English Church as a source of revenue for himself and his court. This was an evil fruit produced by the base act of surrender of which John was guilty. Like other acts of tyranny, however, it awakened a vigorous opposition, and served to help forward that systematic opposition to Rome which was steadily growing in England throughout this century. At the octaves of the Epiphany (1226) there was a large council gathered at Westminster of prelates and laymen to hear (as the chronicler puts it) the "commands of the lord Pope" as lately brought over by the Legate Otho. The king was not able to be present, as he had been seized with violent illness at Marlborough, and this turned out a fortunate circumstance. For the commands of the lord Pope were nothing less than a definite demand that two prebends in each cathedral church and two monks' portions in each monastery should be permanently assigned to the Roman Church. The ground on which the demand is made is remarkable for its candour. The Roman Church, the Pope

[1] The great subject of the numerous ecclesiastical satirists of the fourteenth century is the Friars. See especially Piers Plowman and Mr. Wright's volume of Satirical Songs. See also Chapter XXIV.

alleged, had got a very bad reputation for its covetousness, and for exacting bribes from every suitor in its courts. These accusations were true, but the cause of them was the poverty of the Church, and therefore all faithful persons should make it their business to remove this poverty. Accordingly, the prebends and monks' portions were demanded.[1] The prelates assembled were somewhat overwhelmed by this demand, but after consulting together they found a convenient answer. The king, they said, and many leading prelates were absent; in their absence no answer could be given. Otho, thus baffled, adjourned the Synod to mid-Lent, when he hoped for better success, but the prelates would not accept the prorogation, or undertake to assemble at that time, being incompetent, as they said, to act. In the meantime Archbishop Langton determined to try a counter-movement. He represented at Rome that Otho, a foreigner, was not likely to succeed in so delicate a business as that which had been entrusted to him. The Pope, taking this view, immediately recalled Otho, who, much to his dismay, when he had arrived at Northampton, hoping to finish his commission, received the papal letters ordering his immediate return. The archbishop was then charged to negotiate the matter for the Pope. But the interests of the English Church were safe in the hands of Langton. He called together the prelates at Westminster after Easter, and having read the Pope's letters, there arose a general laugh in the assembly at the ingenuous manner in which the Pope confessed the greediness of his own court. The answer given was admirable for its irony. "These matters," said the king and English prelates, "belong to the whole of Christendom. We are a little Church in the corner of the world. When other parts of the Church have recognised their obligations in a practical form, we shall not be found lacking."[2] It was well known to all those present that a similar demand made by the Pope on the Church of France had just been rejected with indignation.

15. But though the formal cession to the Pope of definite English benefices was rejected somewhat con-

[1] R. de Wendover, iv. 115. [2] *Ib.*, iv. 124.

temptuously by the English Church, the opportunities of his position nevertheless enabled the Pope to prey heavily on the revenues of England. When the Church suffered the great loss of Archbishop Stephen Langton—a man who throughout his career had been of most signal service to his Church and nation—the monks of Canterbury, being allowed to proceed to a free election, abused their privilege by electing an obscure monk of ill repute named Walter de Hemisham.[1] The suffragan bishops had by no means abandoned their claim of a right to concur in the election of the Primate, and they moved the king to refuse to accept this election, in which they had not been consulted. The king readily agreed, and, following the ill-precedents of the last election, adopted the policy of raising an obstacle against Walter by causing him to be opposed at Rome. The Pope, whose predecessor Honorius had been so lately foiled in his project for obtaining English benefices, was not likely to be very complaisant. It was necessary, therefore, to offer him a huge bribe before his consent could be obtained. Upon the condition of his absolutely rejecting Walter and accepting and confirming the nominee of the king and bishops—Richard Grant (or Le Grand), Chancellor of Lincoln—the king covenanted to give the Pope a tenth of all the revenue of England both lay and clerical—an income-tax of two shillings in the pound. For this enormous bribe, Richard was accepted, and consecrated at Canterbury. He was, says Wendover, "*given* to the Church, not elected;"[2] but he can scarcely be regarded as simply intruded by the Pope, inasmuch as he was expressly taken on the nomination of the king and bishops, though without any formal election.

16. The king had obtained from the Pope the archbishop he desired. It now remained to be seen how he would bring about the fulfilment of his promise to the Pope of paying to him the tenth of all the revenues of his subjects. Henry had lately signalised his coming of age by some very

[1] He was utterly ignorant, as was proved by his examination at Rome. His father had been hanged for felony. He himself had corrupted a nun, and had children by her.—Wendover, iv. 170.

[2] *Ib.*, iv. 186.

high-handed and unjust exactions of money, so that the proposal of giving a tenth to the Pope was not likely to be received with much satisfaction. The barons indeed refused utterly to entertain the notion. They would give no tenths, they said. Their baronies and possessions were no fiefs of the Roman Church. What claim had the Pope upon them?[1] But the bishops, abbots, and the rest of the clergy could not so easily dispose of the claim. Having both Pope and King against them, it was hard for them to resist. They deliberated long and murmured loudly, but at last, through fear of the dread censure of the Church, they yielded.[2] Gregory IX. was at this time engaged in a scandalous war with the Emperor. The Church of England was to be pillaged to carry on his martial projects, and pillaged it was without mercy. Stephen, the agent employed by the Pope, insisted on the tenth being paid on the whole gross revenue, without any of the deductions usually allowed. Armed with letters authorising him to excommunicate or interdict as he pleased, the papal envoy not only exacted an unheard-of amount, but exacted it to be paid without any delay, so that the unhappy clergy had to borrow of the usurers to meet his demands. "So villanous an exacter was he," says Wendover, "that he even compelled every one to pay him the price of the tenth of the crops which were to ripen in the autumn, and which were yet only in the growing grass. The prelates had to sell their chalices, flagons, relic-cases, and the other sacred vessels of the altar, or to put them in pledge. The whole land was full of maledictions, men swearing that of such an exaction no good fruit could come."[3] A tribe of usurers and money-lenders followed in the footsteps of the papal envoy, and now was first heard in England that odious word *Caursins*, which came to be applied to the Italian harpies, who, by ruinous usury, long preyed upon the vitals of the English Church.[4]

17. In addition to the intolerable exaction of subsidies, the Church of England was now suffering from another

[1] R. de Wendover, iv. 201. [2] *Ib.* [3] *Ib.* 202.

[4] Matt. Paris, *Hist. Maj.* p. 362 (ed. Wats). The name is derived from a union of *causantes*, making a claim, and *ursini*, acting like bears.

special grievance proceeding from Rome. Not only did the Pope constantly intrude foreign ecclesiastics into benefices, but he actually issued inhibitions to bishops and other patrons of benefices to forbid their appointing to any preferment until five Romans (the names not even being mentioned) had been provided for at the rate of 100 marks each.[1] These oppressions soon provoked a spirited resistance. As there was no help to be found in the king and the law, the sufferers proceeded to take the matter into their own hands. In the year 1231 mysterious letters began to be handed about among influential laymen and monasteries, whose cause was the same, purporting to come from the *common council*, or from the *council of the great men*, "who would sooner die than be ruined by the Romans." These letters were sealed with a device representing two swords, with the legend *Ecce duo gladii*. Soon, all over the country, and at a great many different points at once, the foreign ecclesiastics at England, or their farmers, found with dismay their full barns invaded by parties of strange men in masks, who, after having emptied the barns, opened a market and sold the corn cheap to the poor. When the authorities interfered, the masks showed what they called the king's letters patent, which being accepted as good warrant, probably without much inquiry as to how they were come by,[2] enabled the unknown spoilers to proceed quietly and systematically in their work. The men in disguise obtained the name of *Lewythiel*, from the name of their leader William Witham or William the Witherer (Scatterer), but whose real name was Sir Robert de Twenge.[3] They were said not to exceed eighty in number, but so well were their plans laid and their small forces distributed, that they kept the foreign incumbents throughout England in a state of abject fear and terror. The Pope of course soon interfered. He addressed a pompous letter to the Archbishop of York and the other prelates of England, complaining of their apathy;

[1] Wendover, iv. 229.

[2] *Ib.*, iv. 237. There is little doubt that the Justiciary Hubert de Burgh was secretly privy to these proceedings, and encouraged them.

[3] *Ib.*, iv. 240.

declaring that one of his officers had been torn in pieces and another almost killed; asserting that he had in fact used great leniency towards the English Church by allowing a patron to present as he pleased after the death of a foreign incumbent; and calling upon them to use freely the censures of the Church against these ill-doers.[1] Meantime the Roman ecclesiastics in England lived in a state of abject terror. Occasionally one of them (as Cincius, a canon of St. Paul's) was seized and robbed,[2] but for the most part they shut themselves up carefully until the Pope's menaces should have caused the danger to pass away. As for the leader of the Lewythiel, Sir Robert de Twenge, he soon afterwards boldly declared himself, and having a distinct grievance, even under the Pope's arrangements, inasmuch as two foreign incumbents in succession had been intruded on his church at Lytham, he went to Rome and obtained redress.

18. Not content with spoiling the English Church of its revenues, and filling its benefices with aliens, the Pope now assumed and exercised the power of nominating its Primate. After the death of Richard in 1231[3] the Canterbury monks elected the chancellor Ralph de Neville. He was known at Rome to be opposed to papal interests, and so was rejected by the Pope on the ground of his being "a court divine and illiterate."[4] Again the monks elected their prior John. He was severely examined at Rome, but stood the test well. However, he did not satisfy the Pope's requirements, and he was induced to resign on account of his age and too great "simplicity."[5] A third election was made by the monks in 1233 of John Blundel. He was accused of simony and holding a plurality of benefices, and his election also was declared void.[6] Then the Pope, alleging that he could not allow so important a

[1] *Annal. de Burton, Ann. Monast.*, i. 239.

[2] R. de Wendover, iv. 231.

[3] Richard Wethershed, or Richard le Grand (Grant), appears to have been completely devoted to Rome. He is said by some to have held a council in England; but this appears to be an error. He only applied at Rome for certain constitutions.—R. de Wendover, iv. 226.

[4] R. de Wendover, iv. 227. [5] *Ib.*, iv. 243. [6] *Ib.*, iv. 267.

church to be any longer without a pastor, ordered the monks who were at Rome to elect Edmund, Canon of Salisbury. They were constrained to obey, though they determined not to receive him or any other except the monastery should agree to the choice.[1] Edmund was therefore completely the nominee of the Pope, the monks having exercised no free choice. The Pope sent him the pall, and thus, though by an unjustifiable exercise of power, gave to the Church of England an excellent and devoted Primate—a worthy successor of Stephen Langton, who had been intruded on the Church by a similar stretch of papal power.

19. About this time the Pope thought fit to order a general visitation of monasteries. Those which belonged immediately to the care of the Roman See and were exempt from diocesan supervision, as the Cistercians and Premonstratensians, were to be visited by commissioners specially appointed by the Pope. Those, the care of which was in the hands of the bishop of the diocese, as the Benedictines, were to be visited by the bishop. The Pope declares that it has come to his ears that the monasteries in the province of Canterbury are full of great abuses, both in temporals and spirituals, that the evil living and carelessness of their inmates is notorious,[2] and not desiring to be partaker in their sins, he directs a strict visitation of all houses of monks, canons, and nuns, and an unsparing punishment of all evil-doers. The monkish historian who records the event, and to whom all such visitations were an utter abomination, declares that the special visitors appointed by the Pope performed their work with great cruelty and harshness; and of the visitation generally he says that it did a great deal more harm than good, inasmuch as before this there had been a uniformity in observing the rule of St. Benedict, but now, by the new constitutions made by the visitors, no two monasteries were alike in their way of living.[3]

[1] R. de Wendover, iv. 267.

[2] Compare with this the Bull of Innocent VIII. in the fifteenth century (1479). See Chap. XXIV.

[3] R. de Wendover, iv. 258, 260; *Ann. de Burton*, *Ann. Monast.*, i. 243.

20. In the year 1235 there succeeded to the episcopate one who was destined to do more than any man of his day in carrying out the reforms thus commanded by the Pope —one who continued during the eighteen years of his episcopate to hold by far the foremost position among the prelates of the English Church. This was Robert, surnamed from his personal peculiarity, Grosseteste—by birth a Suffolk peasant, but long known as the most eminent teacher in the University of Oxford—a man profoundly skilled in all the wisdom of his day, both in physics and theology. Grosseteste had long been connected with the church of Lincoln, having been promoted by Bishop Hugh de Wells to various offices in it. At the time of his election he was archdeacon of Leicester. He was, says Matthew Paris, "a man even too learned, and from his very early years educated in the schools."[1] He had been selected by the Franciscans as their teacher at Oxford, and to them and to the Dominicans he was ardently attached. To the Friars he looked for his instruments in the reformation of the Church which he designed, and he found them at first very effective and valuable instruments. Bishop Grosseteste entered upon his work when the oppressions and exactions of Rome were pressing heavily upon the National Church. He saw the evil increase and become intensified, and for a long time he quietly acquiesced in and even upheld it. At length the mischief and ruin of the Roman intrusions became too strong for him to bear. He recoiled against Rome with startling force and energy, and uttered anathemas against her abuses, which mark most strongly the height which the reaction against the papal pretensions had reached by the middle of the thirteenth century.

21. Of the state of the Church in England at this period Matthew Paris draws a most melancholy picture. "The fire of faith had grown so cold, that it was almost reduced

[1] Matt. Paris, *Hist. Maj.*, p. 409 (ed. Wats). We now take leave of Roger de Wendover as an authority, whose narrative up to this point was adopted by Matthew Paris with some small additions and alterations. For the next thirty years we have the full, rich, and spirited narrative of Matthew Paris.

to ashes with scarce a spark in them. Simony was perpetrated without a blush, usurers plied their trade everywhere. Charity was dead, ecclesiastical liberty had wasted away, religion was trodden under foot. The daughter of sin was like a shameless harlot. Every day persons, the most contemptible and illiterate, armed with Roman bulls, exacted by threats the revenues left by holy fathers for religious uses. If any appealed, they procured their excommunication. Where formerly there were noble and well-mannered clerks to practise hospitality and to relieve the poor, there low-bred churls, without polish but full of craft, the farmers of the Romans, pillaged everything to send to their masters in foreign lands, who lived luxuriously on the patrimony of the Crucified One. Better would it be to die than to be forced to witness the evil brought upon our nation and upon the saints of God." [1]

22. It was when men's minds were in this state—full of heaviness for the manifold evils pressing upon the Church—that another special Legate appeared in England. His coming was hailed with universal anger and indignation. Archbishop Edmund boldly reproved the king for thus secretly introducing one who was nothing less than the enemy of the Church and country,[2] and whose coming was only desired by the king to assist him to prey upon the revenues of his subjects. But Henry heeded not the reproof. He had his own ends to serve in bringing the Legate over, and a crowd of hungry and shameless prelates, who were eagerly looking for indulgences and benefits from the Pope's plenipotentiary, loaded him with costly gifts and flattery. The Legate is said to have shown some moderation, and to have accepted only a part of the good things pressed upon him.[3] But he affected a royal state, and having issued his orders for a general council of the English Church, he directed that a high throne should be built for himself at the west end of St. Paul's, that he might preside like a monarch among his subjects.[4]

23. It was not among an over-friendly assemblage, either of laymen or clerks, that the Legate Otho took his

[1] Matt. Paris, *Hist. Maj.*, p. 438.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 440.
[3] *Ib.*, pp. 443, 446.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 446.

presidential chair in St. Paul's on the morrow of the octave of St. Martin (November 19, 1237), to hold the Council of London.[1] A fearful storm raged around. The looks of the barons were so menacing, that the Legate had obtained a guard of two hundred men-at-arms from the king. He came in at the early dawn, and having vested himself in his surplice and choral cope, proceeded to his throne, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, with a solemn procession of cross-bearers and thurifers preceding him. The council was then opened by the usual religious forms, and after a revival of the old dispute between the two Primates, which the Legate did his best to quiet, the business of the meeting was commenced. Upon the promulgation of the canon passed by the Lateran Council against pluralities, Walter de Cantilupe, bishop of Worcester, rose, and laying aside his mitre, addressed the Legate. It would, he said, be very hard on old men who had held benefices for many years, and had exercised good hospitality, to take their benefices away and to reduce them to poverty. As for the young, no doubt they would resist by force of arms such a spoliation. He would therefore counsel the Legate to withdraw this injunction.[2] The Legate, seeing that the assembly went with the speaker, declared that if the bishops were of such a mind the matter might be referred to the Pope. He then proceeded to promulgate his Constitutions.[3]

24. The anger excited against the Legate and the excitement produced by his attempt to put down pluralities continued to increase. It was felt to be somewhat more than bearable that Rome, which conferred without scruple English benefices upon foreigners who never visited their parishes, should arbitrarily interfere to prevent English

[1] The Council opened on this day, but the Legate did not take his seat till the day following.

[2] Matt. Paris, p. 448. In enforcing the Lateran canons as to pluralities and secular employment of clergy, it was really intended not to put a stop to these things, but to make a dispensation for them necessary, thus filling the coffers of Rome. See Dr. Hook, *Lives of Archbishops*, vol. iii. c. iii.

[3] An abstract of these will be found in Notes and Illustrations to this Chapter

incumbents, who, at any rate, were within reach of their cures, holding more benefices than one. It was discerned clearly enough that it was not a zeal for the well-being of the Church which prompted this policy, but the desire either to obtain the fees for granting a dispensation, or to dispossess incumbents from that which they had long enjoyed, in order that there might be the more to confer on the aliens. The Pope hearing of the excitement which prevailed, and fearing for the safety of his Legate, sent an order to him to return to Rome. But Cardinal Otho, who found England, in spite of the menaces of his opponents, a profitable field of labour, and had the zealous support of the king, who desired his aid against his subjects, contrived to persuade the Pope that it was better that he should remain.[1] Possibly he may have somewhat repented of his boldness when, soon afterwards, the riot took place at Oxford,[2] which caused him to escape secretly, and to ride in deadly terror of his life to the king. The vindictive proceedings in which he indulged against the Oxford students, show his terror and his anger. But the students found a bold protector in the person of their diocesan, who had long been their chancellor, Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln. He appeared before King and Legate when they were taking counsel as to what punishment should be exacted from the students, and demanded the liberation of those who had been imprisoned, threatening to excommunicate all who had laid hands on them. Through his intrepid defence the students who had been seized were given up to him.[3]

25. About this time the discontent of the clergy, and their angry feeling towards the King for at once mulcting them in their revenues and upholding the oppressions of Rome against them—while he did not hesitate to invade their most cherished privileges, to cause them to plead in

[1] Matt. Paris, p. 446.

[2] The particulars are given in all the chronicles (see Chron. Oseney and Burton) and in Matt. Paris. The students came to Oseney to salute the Legate, but were treated with insolence by his retinue, and one of their number shot accidentally the master cook, who was a near relative of the Legate. Otho fled to the tower of the abbey, and stood a sort of siege, escaping by night.

[3] *Ann. Monast.*, i. 254.

secular courts, and to determine matters purely ecclesiastical by decisions of temporal judges—found vent in a long paper of grievances, presented to the King by the archbishops and bishops. This specifies minutely various points in which ecclesiastical immunity had been interfered with.[1] It would seem as though the King had the unhappy faculty of trampling upon the rights of all his subjects, whether lay or clerical, and of exciting universal discontent. Thus, though professing the deepest devotion to the Church, and desiring to be called the most pious king in Christendom, he always had the clergy of the land against him, and the presence of a Legate became a necessity for him, to restrain by the dreaded power of Rome their bold remonstrances. Henry was, in fact, altogether un-English. He loved foreigners, and his constant endeavour was to thrust them into the high places of both Church and State. The indecent and undignified struggle which he carried on for five years against the Chapter of Winchester, in endeavouring to thrust upon them the queen's uncle, William of Savoy, became notorious throughout Europe.[2] In this the King was foiled, mainly through the intrepid action of Bishop Grosseteste, who was destined on many occasions to head a successful resistance to his encroachments.[3] The spirit of opposition developed towards the King stimulated and increased that felt towards the Legate and his demands. The two were regarded as the double-headed enemy of the clergy, and their assaults evoked a spirit which often attained its end. Thus, in the year 1239, a demand made on the prelates of England assembled in London at the end of July, that they should pay a new tax to the Legate by way of procurations, was energetically rejected. The answer made was, that "they would bear these things no longer. Let him support you who has sent you here without any demand on our part."[4] In the same spirit that dictated this curt refusal, the barons of

[1] Printed in *Burton Annals*, *Ann. Monast.*, i. 254, *sq.*

[2] Matt. Paris, p. 617.

[3] As notably in the case of John Mansel, promoted by the king to the prebend of Thame, but rejected by the bishop. See *Epist. R. Grosseteste* (ed. Luard), cii.

[4] Matt. Paris, pp. 488, 515.

England at this time sent letters to Rome by the hand of the bold Robert de Twenge, who, though he was known to have been the leader of the *Lewythiel*, did not fear to approach the Pope whom he had so much angered. The letters asserted that it had been the custom in England from time immemorial, that, on a vacancy occurring in a church the patrons of the church should present a fitting clerk to the bishop, who was bound to admit him; but now, say they, "such adversity has fallen upon us by your connivance, that when rectors of churches die, your officers everywhere present to the vacant churches which are in our patronage, to the prejudice of our liberty and to the eminent danger of our losing the right of patronage altogether; although your own letters allow us to present after a vacancy caused by a foreigner. The contrary to which allowance is every day forced upon us." This was the case with Sir Robert de Twenge in his church of Lytham, and the nobles pray that this injury may be redressed, and that the evil custom of forcing foreign incumbents upon churches may be abated. The Pope, seeing that the opposition was becoming serious, wrote a conciliatory reply.[1] There was, however, no real thought of relaxing the burdens which were pressing so heavily upon the English Church. The Legate continually demanded fresh contributions for his support; the King used all sorts of expedients for robbing the clergy. He kept benefices in his hands, and absorbed the revenues; he seized on the goods of dead Churchmen whenever there was any indistinctness in their wills. He was ready to sanction any oppression for a bribe.[2] But the attitude of the prelates and nobles became so menacing, that the King himself now desired the Legate to withdraw from the country. Otho refused, or at least delayed to do so. He was still hungering for more spoils, and the clergy were once again assailed for procurations.[3] The Crusade was made a source of profit. Any one who had taken the vow might be absolved for a payment of money. The Pope, engaged in his war with the Emperor, was raging for more funds, and after all the exactions which

[1] Matt. Paris, pp. 513, 514. [2] *Ib.*, p. 524. [3] *Ib.*

had been perpetrated on the clergy, the Legate, at a council assembled at Reading, had the audacity to demand a fifth part of the ecclesiastical revenue to enable the Father of Christendom to carry on his campaigns. This, at first, was indignantly refused. But the resisting power of the Church, so long as the prelates acknowledged the right of the Pope to lord it over them, must of necessity be feeble. With the King and the Pope combined to play into each other's hands, the clergy must needs in the end yield. Thus, when Archbishop Edmund had procured from the Pope, as he thought, a strong command to the King to desist from his evil practice of keeping benefices vacant, and was beginning to believe himself another St. Thomas,[1] he suddenly found that the Pope had played him false, revoked the command, and left the King to spoil the Church as he pleased. The archbishop in despair gave up the struggle, and submitted without further resistance to the demand for a fifth; the rest of the prelates, after his example, "allowing themselves to glide into a similar ruin."[2] But in Rome there were no bowels of compassion for the English Church. The greatness of the sacrifice thus made by the clergy did not avail to arrest the hand of the spoiler. "About that time," says Matthew Paris, "was made that most iniquitous agreement between the Pope and the Romans, that they should have at their disposal all the benefices in England for their sons and relatives, if they would strenuously assist him against the Emperor. Soon afterwards the Archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops of Lincoln and Salisbury, received his commands to provide for 300 Romans out of the first benefices which fell vacant, and they were to regard themselves as suspended from all right of institution until that number was competently provided for. Upon this a mighty amazement possessed the hearts of those who heard of it, and it was feared that one who dared such things, must be drowned in the abyss of desperation."[3]

26. The shock of this new piece of tyranny was too much for the archbishop. He had yielded with great reluctance to the inordinate demand of the fifth. Before

[1] Matt. Paris, p. 527. [2] *Ib.* [3] *Ib.*, p. 532.

he had recovered from this came this second and overwhelming blow. "Seeing," says the chronicler, "the Church of England to be day by day more trodden under foot, robbed of its possessions, despoiled of its liberties, life became insupportable to him, and he could not endure to see the evils which were upon the land. He applied to the King for permission to depart, but could get no answer. Harassed with all these trials, he went into exile, and, passing over to France, he took up his abode at Pontigny, where his predecessor, St. Thomas, had dwelt as an exile, and there gave himself uninterruptedly to prayers and fastings."[1] Of ascetic temperament, and of a texture of mind rather contemplative than active,[2] the archbishop was not suited to contend with the manifold evils of his day. His principles and his heart were thoroughly national. He upheld the rights of the Church as against an encroaching King; but he also upheld the rights of the Church of England as against a tyrannical Pope. Thus he had support from neither side. Neither was there any efficient help from his suffragans. Bishop Grosseteste was indeed ready enough to support him as against encroachments of the King, but the commands of the Pope were as yet to him sacred, and it needed ten more years of oppression and injustice before the bishop of Lincoln was driven to revolt against the yoke, and to raise his powerful voice in condemnation of the Papal iniquities.

27. The most unscrupulous means were now resorted to by the Legate and the papal officers to obtain the payment of the enormous tax of a fifth from the prelates, abbots, and clergy of the English Church. The resistance of the Primate had been overcome, and by his departure

[1] Matt. Paris, p. 533.

[2] His *Speculum Ecclesiæ* is a treatise of the most ascetic character. It does not evidence any considerable capacity. It was probably not written, but finished and made known at Pontigny. Edmund's life there was very short. He died before the close of the year 1240. His great asceticism made him a saint in the popular estimation, both in England and France, and his canonisation was demanded so violently, that the Pope, though unwilling, was obliged to yield. See Hook, *Lives of Archbishops*, iii. 224

the Church was left without a defender. The King contemptuously refused his aid even in the case of the most crying injustice.[1] The necessity of the case drove the clergy to use every means practicable to defend themselves. The prelates objected to the purpose for which the money was demanded, viz. war against the Emperor, which was a cause of blood. They objected to its being demanded under threats, contrary to ecclesiastical liberty. They declared that, as they could not reach Rome except through the Emperor's territories, the aiding in the war against him would expose them to manifold dangers—that their own land was exposed to perils which might require all their means to meet them. The objections appear to have been so skilfully urged that the Legate was unable to answer them. So long as the prelates and clergy held firmly together he could make no progress in his work. But if any considerable section of the clergy could be made to yield, then their example might be used with force against the others. Accordingly he assailed the clergy of Berkshire with his most insidious attacks, having probably some reason to believe that he should find them more compliant than their brethren. But if this was his project, he was signally foiled in it. For his application to this section of the clergy only availed to draw from them a document in which the papal claims are calmly and unanswerably refuted, and sentiments are expressed which show in a most vivid and striking manner the point to which the reaction against Rome had now reached.[2] "The Church of Rome," says the answer of the clergy, "has its own proper patrimony, the administration of which belongs to the lord Pope, and in a similar manner other churches have theirs, from the gifts and concessions of kings and nobles, which patrimony in no way is subject to tribute to

[1] See Matt. Paris, p. 534.

[2] This paper is printed in Matt. Paris under the year 1240 as the Answer of the Rectors of Berkshire. But in the *Burton Annals* it is printed under the year 1244 as the answer of the English clergy generally. It may have been that it was first drawn up for the particular section of the clergy of whom M. Paris speaks, and afterwards adopted generally.

the Church of Rome. Hence prelates ought not to be compelled to contribute out of their patrimony to the Church of Rome. . . . Churches belong to the lord Pope as regards care and attention, but not as regards dominion and property. The Truth says, 'Thou art Peter,' reserving to Himself the property, committing to him the care, as the following words testify :—'Whatsoever thou shalt bind, and whatsoever thou shalt loose,' not 'whatsoever thou shalt seize or exact on the earth, shall be seized or exacted in heaven.'" A number of special reasons against contributing are subjoined.[1] Upon the report of this rebuff being made to the Pope, he counselled the Legate to proceed by more crafty ways. He was not to attempt to bend any large body of the clergy assembled together, as their union gave them strength and support, but he was to attack them singly and separately, and endeavour, by honeyed words and liberal promises, to overcome their resistance. The clergy, finding themselves absolutely without support from their natural protectors, were by this means in a great measure induced to yield.[2] It was with profound satisfaction that at the beginning of the year 1241 the departure of the Legate was reported. There remained not in the land, says Matthew Paris, so much of money as he had extorted from it. He had bestowed, according to his pleasure, more than three hundred prebends, churches, and good pieces of preferment. The kingdom lay like a vineyard, exposed to the ravages of the wild boar. He left the church of Canterbury, and many other cathedral and conventual churches, in a miserable state of confusion. He settled nothing, for he did not come to protect the sheep, but to enrich himself from them, and he well deserved the fate which awaited him, viz. that the spoil which he had made in England should be seized by the Emperor.[3]

28. On the death of Archbishop Edmund (November 16, 1240) the Canterbury monks were in no position to make a fresh election. They were lying under a sentence of excommunication, inflicted upon them by the late archbishop for fraudulent dealing with documents. Having

[1] Matt. Paris, 525 ; *Ann. Monast.*, i. 265. [2] Matt. Paris, 541.
[3] *Ib.*, 549.

applied to Rome for absolution, the Pope granted a commission with powers to act for the purpose, but Simon de Langton, archdeacon of Canterbury, appealed against this, alleging that the monks had obtained it by false representations. The King now offered to maintain their cause with the Pope, if they on their part would undertake to elect Boniface of Savoy, the Queen's uncle—a young courtier, only in sub-deacon's orders, but nevertheless bishop-elect of Bellay—a man without learning or any clerical experience—but handsome, daring, unscrupulous—a somewhat strange successor of Lanfranc, Anselm, and Langton. The death of two popes hindered for some time the confirmation and consecration of the elect, and in the meantime Boniface showed himself not disinclined to care for the interests of the Church in which he had received such sudden promotion. As his chancellor he appointed Richard de la Wych, better known as St. Richard of Chichester, a man not only of profound piety, but like his friend and first patron St. Edmund, of a truly patriotic and national spirit. The appointment of Boniface was also welcomed by Bishop Grosseteste, who, despairing of help from the non-aggressive temper of the late Primate, thought that in Boniface he had found one who would not shrink from opposing the secular authority in those intrusions on ecclesiastical privileges which so much vexed the soul of the bishop of Lincoln. "We thank the Lord Jesus Christ," writes Grosseteste, "for that He has provided the church of Canterbury, long destitute of a pastor, with that blessing. We hope that after the example of Jesus Christ, the chief pastor, in whom all pastors are one, you will feed the flock committed to you in wisdom and doctrine." He then proceeds to request his aid in the matter of the bishopric of Winchester, in which the king was still resisting the choice of the chapter—William Raleigh, bishop of Norwich—although he, whom he had originally tried to intrude, the foreign bishop of Valentia, was now dead. He reminds Boniface that the Pope had confirmed William Raleigh, and that the King was bound to accept him.[1] Boniface at once took up the case warmly, and induced the king to

[1] Grosseteste, *Epist.*, lxxxiii. (ed. Luard).

forego his opposition to William Raleigh. In another case he also acted readily with the bishop of Lincoln. The king had conferred the bishopric of Chichester on Robert de Passelew, a forest-judge. This was a grievous offence to Grosseteste, who was so strongly opposed to the secular employments of the clergy. He persuaded Boniface to have the bishop-elect tested in his knowledge. Grosseteste himself conducted the examination, and, having reported the candidate as not qualified,[1] Boniface refused to confirm the election, and procured the appointment of Richard de la Wych, his chancellor, who so well became his advancement.

29. The new Archbishop of Canterbury, whose confirmation by the Papal See had been retarded by the death of two popes, was accepted and confirmed by the new Pope Innocent IV. (1243). There appears to have been some expectation that at the accession of Innocent the Roman exactions which had so long troubled the English Church might be mitigated.[2] It was found, however, that so far from this being the case, they were rather increased.[3] It was determined, therefore, by the English prelates to make a formal protest, to be presented to the king and made known throughout the land. "If," say they, "the Pope would consider the state of the primitive Church in England, and compare it with the present, he would not convulse churches and churchmen, nor assail them with exactions as he does; nor would he continue to extort from churches that which is not his; for when St. Augustine, the Apostle of the English, preached the gospel in England, King Ethelbert, being converted to the faith of Christ, instituted the churches of London, Rochester, and Canterbury. In the one he put clerks and priests, in the other monks, assigning to them out of his patrimony lands and possessions sufficient for their support, that they might celebrate divine service, give alms, and exercise hospitality to the poor. In the same manner did other kings to other churches—not, however, giving them their possessions absolutely free, but reserving to themselves rights for three purposes—namely, furnishing of their forces, making bridges, and fortifications,

[1] Matt. Paris, p. 652. [2] *Ib.*, p. 622.
[3] *Ann. de Dunstaplid, Ann. Monast.*, iii. 166.

so as to resist the enemy. If, therefore, these and such like gifts have been made to certain bishops, abbots, and abbeys, from the property and lay fees of kings and princes, by what right is it possible, without injury to the lawful claim of another, to turn the said gifts into other uses, especially those which relate to war and bloodshed? How, then, could the rights of the lay donors be satisfied? It is also in the highest degree dangerous for England to contribute to the war against the Emperor, inasmuch as his dominions are only separated from England by a narrow channel, and he is the brother-in-law of the King, and ought to be respected."[1] Such is the substance of this remarkable protest, which, as entirely ignoring the claims of Rome over the English Church, and asserting the independence of the latter, testifies to the strong development of the national spirit then prevailing. The King, provoked by the inordinate greed of the Romans, which left to him nothing to prey upon, was moved by it to write strongly to the Pope that in his provisions and exactions from the clergy he had not a little oppressed the English Church. Patrons were defrauded of their rights, works of charity languished; he was compelled, therefore, to request the Pope to desist from his demands.[2]

30. Probably it may have been with a view to get rid of this inconvenient and unexpected opposition on the part of the King that the Pope soon after issued a letter exhorting the clergy to contribute for the royal requirements.[3] They, as well as the nobles, were unwilling to do this until they had some security that their liberties and privileges should be respected. But if the Pope was willing to help the King against the clergy, he was not inclined to forget his own interests; he despatched an officer named Martin with orders to obtain contributions by every possible contrivance, and at the same time he addressed a letter to the abbots and monasteries specially exhorting them to be liberal.[4] The clergy were thus placed in the position of being assailed on one side by the King, on the other by the

[1] Matt. Paris, p. 622. [2] *Ib.*, p. 623.

[3] *Ib.*, p. 640. This attempt to raise money from the clergy was foiled by the boldness and prudence of Bishop Grosseteste.

[4] Matt. Paris, p. 642.

Pope. After due deliberation they determined that their contributions should be given to the former rather than to the latter, especially as the Emperor Frederick put forth violent threats against all those who should aid his enemy. Master Martin therefore had to be contented with uttering threats, and with seizing, with more than usual avidity, on every benefice which fell vacant.[1]

31. Pope Innocent IV., intent more than anything else upon carrying on his war with the Emperor, summoned a council to meet at Lyons (1245), and to this assembly several of the English prelates repaired for various reasons. Boniface, elect and confirmed, but not yet consecrated, to Canterbury, went to obtain consecration and the pall. The bishops of Worcester and Hereford (Walter de Cantilupe and Peter de Aquâ Blancâ) being, as Matthew Paris puts it, the two bishops most devoted to the Pope, and most odious to the English, went on some secret matters of their own;[2] and Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, went to endeavour to bring to a conclusion the suit which he had been carrying on against his chapter. This dispute had been raging for some years. The bishop claimed the right of visiting not only the cathedral itself, but also the churches belonging to the prebends and those attached to the cathedral, a claim which, according to Matthew Paris, was altogether unheard of previously.[3] He had been resisted stoutly by the chapter, which was a rich and influential body, and which zealously defended the right of the dean to act as ordinary of all the cathedral churches. Grosseteste, however, who was remarkable for obstinacy and determination of character, persevered,[4] and the matter was now fairly before the Pope for his decision. A decision was indeed arrived at, but in a way not very creditable either to the bishop, the dean of Lincoln, who was also present, or the Pope. The See of Lichfield and Coventry was at the moment vacant. To the dean of Lincoln, Roger de Weseham, this was offered, if he would forego his opposition to the claims of his diocesan; and thus the whole

[1] Matt. Paris, p. 644. [2] *Ib.*, p. 653. [3] *Ib.*, p. 485.

[4] A great number of the letters published in the volume of Grosseteste *Epist.* (ed. Luard) relate to this subject.

matter was patched up. The chapter of Lichfield and Coventry was not consulted.[1] The chapter of Lincoln had to accept the act of their dean, who had thus been bribed to betray their interests. Grosseteste obtained his coveted privilege ; but he had to pay a heavy price for it,[2] a price which must have pressed not a little upon his conscience, when, as was the case soon afterwards, he stood forth as the bold champion of the National Church. Not only did he agree to set his seal to another copy of the infamous cession of England to the Pope made by John, the original of which had been destroyed by fire,[3] but he also undertook to be the Pope's tax-gatherer, and to endeavour to raise for him in England, by the great authority and respect which were universally felt towards him, the money which the Pope's Italian agents failed to procure. The nobles of England addressed to the Pope in his council the strongest possible remonstrances against the way in which the English Church was being pillaged by his orders.[4] The Pope, however, far from listening to this remonstrance, demanded yet further aids,[5] and the foremost of the English bishops undertook to carry out this spoliation for him. Upon his return to England the King charged Grosseteste with this engagement. The bishop of Lincoln defended himself as follows :—"Your Majesty has written to me that you are astonished not a little, and much moved, that I propose personally to assess and collect the tax for our lord the Pope from religious men and clerks. . . . I am compelled to do this by the command of our lord the Pope, whom not to obey is as the sin of witchcraft and idolatry. It is not a matter of astonishment if I deal in this matter ; much rather would it be a matter of astonishment and indignation if, even without being asked or commanded, I should not be ready to do a thing of this sort, or even a greater thing. We see our spiritual father and mother suffering affliction, and were we not to help them in such a state we should be transgress-

[1] One of the monks who was present protested against the transaction.—*Ann. Dunstap.*, *Ann. Monast.*, iii. 168.

[2] See Mr. Luard's Preface to Grosseteste *Epist.*, p. 62.

[3] Matt. Paris, p. 681.

[4] *Ib.*, p. 666.

[5] *Ann. Dunstap.*, *Ann. Monast.*, iii. 167.

ing the commandments of the Lord, we should be throwing away the fear of the Lord and forfeiting his blessing."[1]

32. Happily these were not the sentiments of the English Church generally. The tax demanded of the clergy was nothing less than from the resident clergy one-third of their benefices, from the non-resident one-half, for three years.[2] This was absolute confiscation, and the resistance accordingly was energetic. The King prohibited the gathering of the impost.[3] A general council of the nobles and clergy was held at Westminster (1246), and an answer was drawn up to the Pope's demands. The clergy of England declare that "the English Church has ever been remarkable for its glories, and has always been an honoured member[4] of the holy Church of Rome." Now, however, it is sorely afflicted, and it needs to bring its troubles to the notice of the Apostolic See. With regard to the tax lately inflicted upon the English Church by the Pope at the Council of Lyons, the clergy desire to state, that if the half of the goods of non-residents be taken, it will simply be the ruin of all canons of cathedrals, who are necessarily connected with several churches, and so will be judged non-resident. The same will be the case with the monasteries, which will be held non-resident as respects the churches from which they derive rents. Other clerks who hold more than one benefice will be utterly incapacitated from exercising hospitality and relieving the poor. In fact, the sum demanded is so enormous that it will ruin the whole of the clergy. The Church of England therefore opposes it, and appeals to a general council.[5] The letter of the clergy was supported by one from the nobles, who complain that the clergy are subject to exactions against the will of the King, and that the patrons of churches are defrauded of their rights of presentation by the intrusion of foreigners—foreigner often succeeding foreigner in spite of the papal undertaking to the

[1] Gross. *Epist.* cvi. [2] Matt. Paris, p. 716; *Ann. Monast.*, i. 277.

[3] Matt. Paris, p. 716; *Ann. Dunstap.*, *Ann. Monast.*, iii. 169.

[4] *Membrum speciale.* It is very observable that in this formal document, as in the one quoted above, there is a distinct assertion of the national and independent position of the Church of England.

[5] Matt. Paris, p. 716; *Ann. Burton*, *Ann. Monast.*, i. 278, *sq.*

contrary, and none of them having the least regard for their charge ; all privileges granted by the Pope being constantly recalled by the infamous device of the *non obstante* clause added to his documents.[1] In spite, however, of this formidable and systematic opposition, the papal demands were in a great measure successful.

33. As the exactions of Rome continued to press ever more heavily upon the English Church, even those who were most devoted to Rome were driven into opposition. Thus in 1247, when two Minorite friars came to him with a license from the Pope and the King, to collect money for the former, Bishop Grosseteste refused with indignation to further their work. "This exaction," said he, "is not to be heard of, and is utterly disgraceful, and it is one which cannot be met, touching as it does not my interests only, but also those of the whole clergy and people."[2] Indeed, the unhappy clergy of this period must have been driven to the utmost straits to meet the multiplying claims upon their resources. Archbishop Boniface had obtained from the Pope the grant of the first-fruits of all the benefices in his province to pay off the debt which he declared pressed upon the See of Canterbury. The bishops resisted this, perhaps being incredulous as to the existence of the debt alleged. Upon this the Primate, supported by the papal authority, did not hesitate to suspend the whole of the suffragans of his province, and thus to compel them to yield.[3] We can easily understand the bitterness of spirit with which the great Churchmen met the King at the Parliament held at Westminster in the beginning of 1248—how they reproached him, when he asked for supplies, with his having utterly failed to perform the promises made by him when last they acceded to his requests—with what incredulity and feelings of contempt they must have listened to his abject apologies and profuse promises for the future. There were among the barons of that day men both of in-

[1] By this favourite papal device all privileges and exemptions previously granted were recalled and nullified for the particular case in hand, thus making the Pope's grants utterly illusory.

[2] Matt. Paris, p. 722.

[3] Matt. Paris, p. 734 ; *Ann. Dunstap.* ; *Ann. Monast.*, iii. 181.

telligence and resolution, and the King, neither by servility nor arrogance, was able to carry his point. And as Simon de Montfort and his supporters were beginning to see clearly that it must come to open resistance, and perhaps to the arbitrement of war, before the foreign influences which were desolating the land could be removed, so some at least of the great Churchmen were being taught, that so long as the fictions of the Pope's sovereignty over the Church and the efficacy of his excommunications were upheld, they could hope for no peace or progress. They saw that in the state of things at present existing in Church matters there was something fundamentally wrong; that utterly false and immoral principles had sway; that by money-payments exemptions could be procured for any enormity; that all discipline was frustrated by bribes; in fact, that the one supreme and singular virtue in the eyes of Rome was a readiness to contribute to the papal exchequer.

34. Possessed by these thoughts, and driven to a righteous indignation by the manifold checks by which his attempts at reformation were met by means of purchased papal exemptions, Bishop Grosseteste determined once more to seek the papal court at Lyons (1250). He came now not in the spirit in which he had approached the council in 1245. The most devoted, the most learned, the most influential of the papal supporters in England, had been driven by the unmistakable proofs of grievous corruption which abounded, to come with very different feelings, and to address the Pope and Cardinals in a very different tone. Like some prophet of old, Bishop Grosseteste stood before that corrupt conclave, and told them some startling truths. He procured the reading in public before the Pope and his court of a sermon or tract written by him. In this discourse, which remains to us, he first draws a most terrible picture of the corrupt state of the clergy, and then proceeds, "The cause, the fountain, the origin of all this, is this court of Rome, not only in that it does not put to flight these evils, and purge away these abominations, when it alone has the power to do so, and is pledged most fully to do so; but still more because by its dispensations, provisions, and collations to the pastoral care, it appoints

before the eyes of this sun, men such as I have described, not pastors but destroyers of men; and that it may provide for the livelihood of some one person, hands over to the jaws of the beasts of the field and to eternal death many thousands of souls, for the life of each one of which the Son of God was willing to be condemned to a most shameful death. It commits the care of the flock in the midst of ravening wolves, bears, and lions, to one who will take away the milk and the wool; who is unable, ignorant, unwilling, or careless to lead out the flock, to drive it into the pastures and to bring it back to the fold. . . . Is not he who does this guilty of the death of the flock, even though some of it should by chance escape death? . . . The doings of this court are as it were a book, and an instruction to all who have the right of patronage in parish churches, to have regard to the claims of kindred and the flesh, to the recompensing of favours, or to pleasing the powerful, by preferring such as these to the pastoral care, that they may enrich themselves and thus destroy Christ's sheep. The crime is greater in proportion as he who commits it is more highly placed. . . . Those who preside in this See are specially the representatives of Christ, therefore ought they specially to exhibit the works of Christ, and doing so, ought to be obeyed in all things as Jesus Christ. But if any of them should put on the garment of favouritism, or of the flesh, or of the world, or of anything else besides Christ, and so, from the love of this, should command anything opposed to the precepts and will of Christ, he that obeys him in matters of this sort manifestly separates himself from Christ and his body, which is the Church, and from the Pope as representative of Christ and true Pope; and should there be a general obedience paid to him in such matters, then there is a true and complete apostasy, and the revelation of the son of perdition is close at hand. . . . The clamour of the unbridled shamelessness of those who are of the family of this court is multiplied with excessive vehemence, so that we may ask, How can this court be said to preside well over its own household? and how shall it govern the Church of God, if it does not know how to govern its own household, or does not care to do so! . . .

The family of this court has filled the world with lies, has put to flight all modesty, has taken away all confidence in documents, and has lent all boldness to falsifying one's word. . . . Unless it corrects itself in these things without delay, quickly will it be utterly deprived of all good things, and when it shall say Peace and safety, then shall sudden destruction come upon it, and it shall be subjected to the most terrible woes."[1]

35. Thus did an English bishop testify against the manifold oppressions, exactions, and spoliations with which Rome had long been vexing the Church of his land. After delivering this spirited protest, Bishop Grosseteste returned to his See, and set himself once more earnestly to reform the abuses which were rampant both among the regulars and seculars of his diocese. The account given in Matthew Paris represents his visitation of the monasteries as extraordinarily severe and searching.[2] The Pope, perhaps conscience-stricken by Grosseteste's bold words, now granted him power to visit the exempt orders as well as the non-exempt, and to cause the establishment of vicarages by all religious houses which held parochial churches, a salutary arrangement which provided some one settled priest to perform the duties of the Church, and no longer left it to the chance arrangements of the monastery.[3] The energetic bishop not only compelled the religious houses to recognise their obligations towards the parishes whose tithes they had appropriated, but he also obliged those persons who held benefices without having proceeded to the order of priesthood, to become priests, though in this he was in many instances baffled.[4] He was more successful in a systematic opposition which, in concert with some of his brother prelates, he made to the archbishop's claim to exact procurations from the whole of his province. In this claim the Pope refused to confirm Archbishop Boniface.[5] Bishop Grosseteste also was leader of the spirited resistance made by the prelates to the King's demand for a subsidy

[1] Brown, *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum*, vol. ii. pp. 250-258 ; *Chron. de Lanercost, s. a.* 1235.

[2] Matt. Par., p. 815. [3] *Ib.* p. 860. [4] *Ib.* p. 833.

[5] *Ann. de Dunstaplid, Ann. Monast.*, iii. 181.

of a tenth, which had been expressly sanctioned by the Pope. The money was demanded under the pretext of a crusade, but the English prelates, who had suffered so many oppressions from the King, refused to give it unless Magna Charter were solemnly ratified, and a distinct undertaking given that the money should only be spent on the matter for which it was demanded.[1] The King persisting in his demands, it was finally answered that in the absence of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York the prelates were not competent to vote the subsidy. To Grosseteste, the energetic reformer, the bold defender of the liberties of the National Church, the eyes of all men were now turned. At length fully awake to the enormities of the Roman abuses, he prepared himself to resist them with all the energy of his character. "To such a pitch had the avarice of the Romans been allowed to grow," said Matthew Paris, "and such a point had it reached, that the bishop of Lincoln being struck with amazement at it, caused his clerks carefully to reckon and estimate all the revenues of foreigners in England, and it was discovered and found for truth that the present Pope, Innocent IV., had pauperised the whole Church more than all his predecessors from the time of the primitive papacy. The revenue of the alien clerks whom he had planted in England, and whom the Roman Church had enriched, amounted to more than 70,000 marks. The King's revenue could not be reckoned at more than a third part of that sum."[2]

36. It might almost seem as if the Pope were determined to put the bishop of Lincoln's anti-papal sentiments to a test, and to try his powers of resistance, by the action which he now took. He appointed a youth named Frederick de Lavagna, his nephew, to a canonry in Lincoln Cathedral, and sent his mandate to Bishop Grosseteste to induct this youth by his proctor to the next prebend which fell vacant, or any prebend that might chance to be vacant,

[1] Matt. Par., p. 859. The subject had been discussed by the bishops and clergy of the northern province in September. They resolved that there must be a consultation of the clergy of both provinces before they could consent.—Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, ii. 67.

[2] Matt. Par., p. 859.

though it had been promised to another. This was to bring matters to a definite issue—a boy—not in orders—a foreigner—not even presenting himself to be inducted—nor having any intention of appearing or performing any of the duties of the office—was by the imperious mandate of the Pope intruded upon an English cathedral. If this were endured and endured quietly, and by a leading bishop, and one who had taken of late so strong a national part in Church matters, then the liberties of the English Church were absolutely gone, and there was no refuge, no defence.

37. Happily, however, for the cause of the Church of the land, Bishop Grosseteste was equal to the occasion. He distinctly refused to admit the Pope's nominee, and addressed to the Pope's commissaries in England a letter which must be ever memorable in English Church history, and which laid the foundation for the bold protests of Wycliffe, and for the national recoil from Rome of the sixteenth century. Having recited the Pope's letter and declared himself willing to obey apostolical commands, the bishop proceeds, "The letter above mentioned is not in its tenor agreeable to apostolical holiness, but is very alien from it, and altogether discordant. In the first place, in this letter, and in others like it spread widely abroad, the 'notwithstandings' which are heaped up in such vast quantity, being not drawn from any necessity of observing the law of nature, produce a wide deluge of fickleness, audacity, and shameless insolence of lying and deceiving, a distrust in believing or giving faith to anybody, and all the vices which follow from these things, which are innumerable; disturbing and confusing the purity of the Christian religion, and the quiet of social intercourse among men. Secondly, since the sin of Lucifer, with which that of antichrist, the son of perdition, in the latter times, will be the same, 'whom the Lord Jesus shall destroy with the breath of his mouth,' there neither is nor can be any sort of sin so adverse and contrary to the doctrine of the Apostles and the Gospel, and to the Lord Jesus Christ Himself; so hateful, detestable, and abominable, and to the human race so destructive, as to kill and destroy by robbing them of the

pastoral office and the ministry, those souls meant to be quickened and saved by the office and ministry of the pastoral care. And this sin Holy Scripture clearly shows is committed by those, who, having power over the pastoral care, provide for their own carnal and temporal desires and necessities from the milk and wool of the sheep of Christ, and do not administer the pastoral office to work the eternal salvation of the sheep of Christ. . . . Those who introduce into the Church of God such slayers of the divine image and handiwork in the sheep of Christ, are worse than the murderers themselves, and are nearer to Lucifer and Antichrist; and in this gradation of wickedness those especially excel, who, from a greater and diviner power given to them from God, for edification and not for destruction, are more especially bound to exclude and root out from the Church of God such most evil destroyers. It cannot be that the most holy Apostolic See can either command or enjoin anything so hateful as this, or can make any attempt at such a thing. For this would evidently amount to a falling off, a corruption, a misusing of its most holy and plenary power, a complete departure from the throne of the glory of Jesus Christ, and a very close sitting side by side with the two principles of darkness in the pestilential seat of hellish punishments. Nor can any one, who is subject and faithful to the said See in immaculate and sincere obedience, and not cut off from the body of Christ and the same Holy See by schism, obey commands or precepts or attempts of any description of such a character as this, from whatever quarter they come, even if it should be from the highest order of angels, but must of necessity with his whole strength resist them and rebel against them. On this ground, out of the debt of obedience and fidelity in which I am bound to the Holy Apostolic See, and from my love of union with it in the body of Christ, I refuse to obey the things which are contained in the said letter, because they most evidently tend to the sin which I have mentioned, most abominable to the Lord Jesus Christ, and most pernicious to the human race, and are altogether opposed to the holiness of the Apostolic See, and are contrary to Catholic unity. I oppose these

things, and rebel against them. . . . These provisions, as they are called, are not for edification, but for most manifest destruction, therefore the blessed Apostolic See cannot enforce them, for 'flesh and blood,' which shall not possess the kingdom of God, has revealed them, and not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ who is in heaven." [1]

38. Although no recoil is here made from the Pope's mandate upon Church principles, and the plenary authority of the Apostolic See is still fully recognised, yet by the declaration that the minister of Christ might become Antichrist, and by the strong condemnation of the iniquity of the act in question, the bishop takes up ground which is suggestive of and introductory to a more complete and systematic rejection of papal authority. Innocent was transported with fury when the bishop's bold opposition and severe reproof were made known to him. According to the Lanercost Chronicle he immediately excommunicated Grosseteste.[2] But it is more probable that he was dissuaded from doing this by the Cardinals, who feared the scandal which would be brought about by cursing one with such an European reputation as the bishop of Lincoln.[3] Certainly, if Grosseteste were excommunicated, he paid no regard to the sentence. He followed up his letter to the Pope's commissaries by one addressed to the "nobles of England, the citizens of London, and the commons of the whole kingdom," in which he makes an earnest appeal to them to protect the national independence of the English Church. "Would that the faithful and beloved children of the English Church and her noble pupils would mark the injury which that noble Church is receiving, that Church which is their mother, which has regenerated them with the Spirit and with water; a Church which beyond all others in Christendom abounds in temporal goods, and has flourished in such a special freedom as to have been for a long time free and untouched by the impositions and provisions of the Roman Court, its goods not being exacted from it by the hands of aliens, but the inhabitants of the kingdom, its children, uniting to defend it. But now it is

[1] Gross. *Epist.* cxxvii.; Matt. Paris, p. 870.

[2] *Chron. de Lanercost, s.a.* 1235. [3] Matt. Paris, p. 872.

worn down and torn with so many oppressions and provisions, that while its own people are thirsting, it is compelled to give its milk (in grief be it spoken) for the use of aliens and foreigners, and its ample patrimony is ceded to the profit of a people whom it knows not; that patrimony which the pious devotion of the great men of old most devoutly gave for the advancement of divine worship, and the support of the ministers of the Church and the poor of Christ; this now, against the will of its founders, is seized without reason, not only by unknown persons, but even by capital enemies, the inhabitants of remote regions, who not only strive to tear off the fleece, but do not even know the features of their flock, do not understand their language, neglect the care of souls, and yet collect and carry away money to the pauperising of the kingdom. And, unless a remedy be speedily applied with all caution against it, by means of these reservations, provisions, impositions, and processes of the Apostolical See, which through the too great patience of the English (I should rather say too great folly) day by day grow stronger, that Church which was of old free will be subjected to a perpetual tribute. Let, therefore, the noble knights of England, the renowned citizens of London, and the whole kingdom, take heed of the injury of their exalted mother, and rise like men to repel it. Let them see and understand if it be fitting and expedient that Englishmen (like oxen and sheep which bear the yoke and carry the fleece not for themselves but for others) should behold others reap what they themselves have sown, and that thus those who labour the least should claim for themselves the food. . . . Let the secular power be effectually armed, that by excluding altogether provisions of this sort, the priesthood of the kingdom may increase in the Lord, and the treasure of the English may be kept for the support of their land, a thing which indeed will not only tend to the unspeakable advantage of the kingdom and people, to glorious title of praise for ever to be remembered, but also to an immense accumulation of merits in the sight of God."[1]

39. Here speaks with no uncertain voice the English

[1] Gross. *Epist.* cxxxi.

bishop, with a distinct perception of the rights of the National Church. The last illness of the great prelate followed soon after the writing of the words above quoted (1253), and in his last illness he even more distinctly and emphatically charged the Pope with the sin of heresy for thus disposing of the benefices of the Church, and declared that, in thus acting, he was a true Antichrist. "Christ," he said, "came into the world to win souls; if then any one fears not to destroy souls, is he not rightly called Antichrist?" He again enumerates the manifold abuses of the Roman See, its disregard of rights, its encouragement of usury, its dispensations with solemn vows, its misuse of patronage, its intrusion of legates, its allowance to unconsecrated persons to hold Sees. With his dying breath and with his last utterances, did he who had in his day been the strongest upholder of the papacy and its most devoted servant, convinced at last of the iniquity of its claims, denounce its abuses, and lend his powerful aid to the reaction against it.[1]

[1] The account of the deathbed of Grosseteste and his last utterances is given in great detail by Matthew Paris, pp. 874-876 (ed. Wats). He also recounts the miracles said to have followed upon his death.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A) THE PROVISIONS OF THE COUNCIL OF OXFORD, 1222.

The resolutions of the Council are prefaced by some general sentences of excommunication against all those guilty of crimes of violence, the invaders or spoilers of churches, and those who had committed ecclesiastical offences. These general sentences were intended probably to touch and awaken the consciences of ill-doers; they could hardly be intended to have the full effect of an excommunication, as the names of the persons who had been guilty of the offences were not specified. They were to be published by the parish priest with all solemnity at Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, and All Hallowtide. The custom was kept up for many centuries, and was in full vigour at the time when reforming opinions began to be adopted. The next four Constitutions relate to the conduct of bishops. They are charged to reside at their churches, executing their office diligently; to take no money for instituting to benefices, nor to delay the admission of clerks, that they may appropriate the revenues of the benefice; to collate to a benefice if the patron does not present within six months. The 6th and 7th Constitutions touch the reverent administration of the sacraments, especially that of the Altar. The words of the canon are to be perfectly pronounced. The priest not to celebrate twice in one day,

except at Christmas and Easter, or when there is a funeral. 8th and 9th Constitutions forbid priests to exercise secular offices, and especially to meddle in cases of blood. 10th orders priests to be diligent in preaching and visiting the sick. 11th provides for the furniture of churches.[1] 12th is directed against evasions of the law as to pluralities. 13th forbids the division of a parsonage or a vicarage into two parts.[2] By 14 no one must be a vicar who is not able to perform the duties. By 15, 16 a vicarage is fixed at five marks (except in Wales, where vicars are content with less), the bishop to settle the charges of the church between rector and vicar. In large parishes there must be two or three priests. (17.) The bishop to take an oath of the person presented, that he has neither given nor promised anything for preferment. (18.) Special confessors to be appointed. (19.) Archdeacons and rural deans not to exceed in their visitations the number of horses and men allowed by the General Council (Lateran, 1215), nor to invite strangers to the procuration; (22) nor to exact payments for not visiting; (23) nor to let their offices to farm. (24.) To examine if the canon of the mass be correct, and if the priest can rightly pronounce the words; to teach laymen the form of baptizing; to examine carefully the ornaments of the church and the minister. (25.) Not to excommunicate or suspend without canonical warning. (26.) No money to be demanded or taken for any ecclesiastical sacrament. (27.) Archdeacons to encourage the peaceful solution of suits. (28.) Not to allow respectable persons to be accused by their apparitors, nor to suffer the apparitors to be judges. (29.) Archdeacons and other dignified clergy to go in a decent habit with close copes, to wear short hair, to abstain from immoderate eating and drinking. (30.) Clergy not to keep concubines publicly, or to visit them publicly; (31) nor to leave bequests to them; (32) nor to alienate the estates of churches; (33) or to build houses on lay fees. (34.) Officials of monasteries to render account to the brethren. (35.) Nuns and monks not to wear silk, or gold or silver. (36.) Abbots to change their chaplains every year. (37.) Corrodies or rentcharges on monasteries not to be given or sold. (38.) Nothing to be exacted from those that enter religious houses. (39.) Other regulations for monasteries. (40.) Monks not to be admitted under eighteen. (41.) Neither clergymen nor laymen to have frequent access to nunneries. (42.) Silence to be observed in religious houses; members not to go out without leave, or without a companion. (43.) The fare of all in the refectory to be the same. (44.) No religious person to make a will. (45.) Canons-regular and monks not to take churches to farm. (46.) Monks only to eat and drink at stated hours. (47.) Two seniors to be present at relaxations in religious houses. (48.) Churches belonging to parsons not to be let to farm. (49.) Marriages not to be causelessly obstructed. (50.) Jews not to keep Christian slaves. (51.) Jews to be distinguished by a special dress. (52.) The Constitutions of the Lateran Council to be observed, and, together with these, to be read and explained yearly in episcopal synods.—Johnson's *English Canons*, ii. pp. 100-121.

[1] "We ordain that every church have a silver chalice and a clean white large linen cloth for the altar . . . books fit for singing and reading, two sets of vestments for the priest, and that the attendants at the altar wear surplices."

[2] It was thought that though a man could not hold two rectories together, by the decree of the Lateran Council, he might hold one and a part of another, or a rectory and a vicarage, or two vicarages.

(B) THE LEGATINE CONSTITUTIONS OF CARDINAL OTHO, 1237.

1. All cathedral, conventual, and diocesan churches to be consecrated within two years of their completion, or else to be interdicted from the celebration of mass. Ancient churches not to be pulled down without consent of the bishop.

2. The sacraments of the Church to be administered without payment, viz. Baptism, Confirmation, Penance, the Eucharist, Extreme Unction, Matrimony, Orders. The way of administering them to form a chief part of the examination for orders.

3. The Saturdays before Easter and Pentecost to be observed for baptism. Parish priests to explain the form of baptism in the vulgar tongue to their parishioners.

4. Priests who will not admit to penance without money to be removed from their benefices.

5. Confessors (special) may be appointed in each deanery.

6. The bishops to inquire carefully before ordinations whether any canonical impediment exists, and lest any persons should stealthily creep in, to make a list of those who are approved, which is to be read out before the ordination.

7. Farming of churches to be discouraged, and dignities (such as archdeaconries) not to be allowed to be farmed.

8 and 9. Churches not to be farmed to laymen nor to ecclesiastical persons for above five years. In no case is a church to be granted in perpetual farm.

10. Only priests to be admitted to vicarages, or deacons who are about to be immediately ordained priests, and the vicar must renounce other appointments. Vicars not priests to apply for orders.

11. Benefices not to be conferred until the bishop is fully satisfied of the death or cession of the previous incumbent.

12 and 13. No church to be divided into several parsonages or vicarages. Those divided to be reunited. All rectors to reside.

14. Clerks not to dress like soldiers and to have trappings for their horses, but to use a long close cope.

15. Married clergy to be removed from their churches. Their sons not to be admitted to churches, being incapable (17).

16. Priests who keep concubines to discharge them within a month, on pain of suspension.

18. Great men not to maintain and countenance robbers.

19. Profession to be made by members of religious orders after a year of probation.

20. Archdeacons to visit churches, but not to be burdensome in exactions, nor to take money for not visiting.

21. Composition of suits not to be hindered.

22. Bishops to reside at their cathedrals, and to celebrate mass on principal festivals and the Sundays in Lent and Advent; also to visit different parts of their dioceses.

23. Judges in causes to be very careful in their decisions.

24. Oaths to speak the truth to be taken in causes ecclesiastical.

25. Suits not to be delayed by insufficient appointments (purposely) of proctors.

26. Letters of citation not to be sent by vile persons who are parties to the suit, and do not summon fittingly, but by the judge's own officer, who is to take care that the party be summoned duly.

27. Letters of contract not to be drawn by clergy, inasmuch as in many cases they are equivalent to forgery.

28. Prelates, monasteries, colleges, etc., to have a common seal, which is to be carefully used.

29. Advocates to make oath that they will perform their duties aright. Judges to be careful in administering their office.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE CLERGY ON THE NATIONAL SIDE AS AGAINST KING AND POPE.

1253-1272.

1. Violent proceedings of Archbishop Boniface in London. 2. He claims *ad interim* jurisdiction in vacant Sees. 3. Irregular exactions from the clergy. 4. Treacherous scheme of the Bishop of Hereford. 5. Mission of Rustand to collect money. 6. Gravamina of the clergy, 7. The Convocation, after great pressure, grant 52,000 marks. 8. Convocation of 1257. 9. Mission of Herlot. 10. Convocation of Merton. 11. Letter of Pope Alexander. 12. Murder of Roman clerks in London. 13. The clergy on the side of the barons. 14. A Legate sent to punish the bishops. 15. Another Legate with more real power. 16. Council of London, 1268. 17. Lay assaults on monasteries. 18. Death of King Henry; character of the period.

1. At the death of Grosseteste there was no bishop of weight of character and strength of purpose to lead the struggle for nationality and independence which had commenced in the English Church. The Primate was a foreigner both by birth and in ideas, and his only care for the Church of England, over which he nominally presided, was to rob it of its revenues, to be spent luxuriously in foreign lands. He had attempted to exact heavy procurations from all the dioceses of his province while he himself was absent, but this had been successfully resisted by the diocesan bishops.[1] Finding that matters could not be managed thus easily, he arrived in England in person towards the end of 1249, and, having been enthroned at Canterbury, proceeded to hold a metropolitical visitation. Commencing with his own cathedral he amerced the monks for their irregularities by heavy fines. He next visited Rochester,[2] and then went on to visit the See of

[1] *Ann. de Dunstap.*, *Ann. Monast.*, iii. 181.

[2] Matt. Paris, p. 780. Matthew Paris says that the archbishop was taught by the example of the bishop of Lincoln to visit the chapters.

London. Here he at once gave clear enough evidence of the spirit in which he meant to prosecute the work. He seized for his lodging a house of the bishop of Chichester without any leave, and sent his armed retainers into the markets to lay hands upon provisions, just as if he had been the king. He visited Fulke, bishop of London, in an insolent and overbearing style, and with a retinue armed to the teeth, and encouraged his followers to revel in the bishop's palace without shame. The Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, upon hearing of his intention to visit them the day following, refused to submit, and appealed to the Pope. The archbishop, in a violent ill-temper, put on his armour under his pontifical robes, and betook himself to the priory of St. Bartholomew. Here the sub-prior and the canons met him in a solemn procession with all honour, but when he announced to them that he was come to hold a visitation on them, they respectfully declined the honour, saying that they had a good bishop who well cared for them. Upon this Archbishop Boniface broke into a furious passion, struck the sub-prior with his fists in the face and in the breast, and seizing a costly cope which he wore, tore it off him and flung it under the feet of his attendants; then, rushing upon the old man, he bore him to the ground upon the steps which separated one block of the seats from another, and, falling upon him, almost killed him. Upon this the other canons dragged Boniface off, and in doing so exposed the coat of mail which he wore under his robes. His followers then came to his aid, and, attacking the unarmed canons, beat, wounded, and maltreated them, until they fled out of the church in terror of their lives, to carry their tale of outrage to the bishop.[1] The bishop sent the canons to the king, but he refused to take up their cause. It was enough for him that the Primate was a foreigner and the queen's uncle. Boniface next proceeded to Harrow, threatening to hold a visitation of the abbey of St. Albans. But the whole of London was in commotion. Ominous threats were directed against the archbishop, and his position became perilous. He elected therefore to retire

[1] Matt. Paris, pp. 780-1.

to Lyons to plead before the Pope against the appeals and complaints which were on their way thither against him, and left England for a short time in peace.[1]

2. A man of the character of this turbulent and avaricious prelate could not have been a valuable leader for the English Church, even if his predilections and principles had been in any way national and English. This, however, was in no true sense the case. Nevertheless, on his return to England in 1252, having been involved in a squabble with the bishop-elect of Winchester, another foreigner, who had great court influence, Boniface affected to favour the national party. At the solemn scene at Westminster, when on the faith of the reiterated promises of the king to observe the charters the clergy granted him a tenth, Archbishop Boniface pronounced a fearful malediction on all who should violate the provisions of Magna Charta. The weight of his condemnation of privilege-breakers could, however, scarcely have been great, for he is constantly found himself in the position of a violator of privileges. At Lincoln, after the death of Grosseteste, he appeared claiming the right of governing the See *ad interim*, which had from time immemorial been the privilege of the Dean and Chapter.[2] The claim was resisted and referred to arbitration, but in the meantime the archbishop, whose object probably was to obtain possession of the fees, continued to act. Soon after this Boniface left England, and actually had the assurance to summon an English bishop-elect to him for consecration abroad, and to consecrate him with the assistance of two foreign bishops. Against this

[1] Matt. Paris, p. 782. Dr. Hook calls Boniface "a brave man," and thinks him possessed of "common sense"—two qualities which seem to be singularly deficient in his character. (See Hook's *Archbishops*, iii. pp. 256-259.) In another place the Dean describes him as a man "of moral force and superior powers" (p. 265). However, a little further on the Dean has apparently changed his mind about him. "Of the principles of Boniface we can say nothing; indeed, he seems to have had none" (p. 270).

[2] *Vide Annal. Monast.*, iii. 189. Among other extraordinary statements which are to be found in his Life of Boniface, Dr. Hook says that he was clearly in the right about this dispute!—*Life*, p. 279.

the bishops of England and the Canterbury monastery vehemently protested.[1]

3. There was then no adequate leader for the clergy of the English Church in that time of special trial which was now coming upon them,[2] when, betrayed by the King to the Pope for the purposes of their joint senseless ambition, and involved in ruinous obligations by the infamous treachery of one of themselves, they were unmercifully pillaged and spoiled. The great difficulty of this period, and the special grievance both of laymen and churchmen, was the uncertain incidence of taxation. That both laymen and churchmen were under an obligation to contribute a fitting amount to the needs of the State there could be no question. That they also owed a contribution to the Pope so long as they accepted him as supreme governor of the Church, and as the final judge in all cases of appeal, may be not unfairly argued. But that either King or Pope had the right to tax the lay and clerical bodies simply according to their own will, and for purposes of their own setting up, without the consent of the bodies taxed, may be strongly denied. It was the persistent attempt to do this which led to so many troubles throughout this period, and which finally issued in the regular establishment of Parliament as the taxing body for the laymen, and of Convocation as that for the clergy. As regards the popes, they had, under the weak and pliant rule of Henry III., practised various methods for enriching themselves from the English Church. Honorius III. had made a simple demand for patronage. Gregory IX. had obtained, with the king's connivance, a tenth of ecclesiastical revenues, and by his Legate had practised all sorts of exactions for raising money. He had also obtained a grant of a fifth of revenue which was exacted from the bishops, while with the monasteries and individual clergy separate negotiations were carried on. Innocent IV., having

[1] Matt. Paris, p. 909.

[2] "Archiepiscopus Cantuariensis qui quasi umbo contra impetus hostiles esse debuit, negotiis variis et secularibus implicatus, et de grege suo in Angliâ minus sollicitus, in partibus agebat transmarinis longe remotis."—Matt. Paris, p. 911.

"exhausted all the other methods of extortion," advanced to bolder schemes. He persuaded the weak king to accept the grant of the crown of Sicily for his young son Edmund, and to promise for this questionable advantage 140,000 marks; and having commenced the war against Manfred, the lawful possessor of the crown, he obtained from Henry's representative, Peter de Aquâ Blancâ, bishop of Hereford, a guarantee on the part of Henry for the repayment of his expenses.[1]

4. The King had thus involved the nation in an enormous expense entirely without its consent, and it became necessary for him, as the Pope pressed for payment, to endeavour to extort the sum needed from the laity and clergy of the realm. Henry had had some experience of the difficulty of compelling either the laymen or the clergy to yield supplies to his demand, and as the Pope's requirements pressed upon him, he was somewhat at a loss how to proceed. It was then that the bishop of Hereford proposed to him a transaction which, as Matthew Paris truly says, is "redolent with the foulest sulphureous odour." The King obtained from the chief prelates, on the pretence of some trifling matter, impressions of their seals on blank paper. Armed with these, the bishop of Hereford went to Rome, and representing to the Pope that King Henry was so much beloved by Churchmen that they were ready to trust him with any amount of their substance, and exhibiting at the same time the blank papers with the seals of the bishops appended, obtained his ready consent for borrowing from the Roman usurers large sums on the credit of the English prelates. These being entered on the papers, which were already fortified by the seals, became legally recoverable by the usurers, and the unfortunate bishops found themselves involved in a huge mass of debt without having been in the least conscious of the transaction.[2]

5. But this swindling transaction, though helpful for the moment, was not sufficient to meet the great demands which the Pope was making on England; and accordingly,

[1] Matt. Paris, p. 896. See Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, ii. 68-70.

[2] Matt. Paris, pp. 910-11.

in the course of the year 1255, there arrived from Rome an envoy of the Pope named Rustand, who was charged to give the character of a Crusade to the war against Manfred, and under this pretext to raise large sums from the clergy.[1] The three years' tithe which had been granted to the king in 1253 for the purposes of a Crusade, and which had been partly raised under a new assessment made by the bishop of Norwich, was to be diverted to this object; and Rustand was empowered to use every means to obtain anticipatory payments, and to practise any other available plans for raising money. The clergy were full of indignation. They had never agreed to pay a tithe for a war against Sicily. They had no wish to put an English prince on that throne. Money which had been hardly extorted from them for what they had deemed a religious object, was now being tyrannically diverted to purposes altogether alien. Thus, when the Parliament met at Westminster at Michaelmas 1255, the general discontent assumed the form of a distinct opposition. The clergy, appearing by their Proctors in Parliament,[2] presented a paper of gravamina, carefully digested, in opposition to the demand made upon them. The chief grounds on which this opposition was based were as follow:—

6. "The Proctors of the beneficed clergy of the archdeaconry of Lincoln put forward on behalf of the whole community that they have suffered a grievance, in that the tenth of their benefices has been granted to the king, they themselves not having been summoned, and that when it is a question of committing any one to an obligation, the express consent of the person obliged is necessary.[3]

[1] The commission of Rustand is given at length in the Burton Annals, which furnish the most valuable authority for the transactions of this period.—*Ann. Monast.*, i. 350, *sq.* Alexander IV. had now succeeded Innocent IV. as Pope, but his policy was the same.

[2] This is the first occasion on which we read of the beneficed clergy being represented by Proctors, who about thirty years later became a constituent part of Convocation.

[3] This statement of a general principle then but little acknowledged is remarkable in an address of this sort. The clergy must refer to the Parliament of 1253.

Also that, supposing there was a consent of the clergy to the tenth, that consent was given that the money should be expended on certain purposes, and those purposes ceasing to be entertained, the grant also ceased and reverted to the granters, and could not fairly be applied to an alien use. The time also for which the tithe is to be claimed is not specified. Various hardships are also inflicted upon them by the modes used by Rustand for collecting the tithe. The goods of deceased persons, which have not been clearly devised, are unfairly seized. The clergy have been grossly abused by the action of the bishop of Hereford. The valuation lately made by the bishop of Norwich is departed from in many cases. The king has been traitorously involved in responsibilities for the kingdom of Apulia, without consent of his subjects. The complainants are ready to help the Church of Rome according to their ability in all lawful matters." The Proctors of the clergy of the diocese of Lichfield and Coventry further complain "that the clergy are grievously oppressed by being made to plead in lay courts, and by divers lay exactions; that they are now taxed for a matter on which they had not been consulted, and of which they do not approve; that the tax is oppressive and exorbitant; that unfair treatment is used, unfitting favours are shown where money has been given; and that the very poor benefices which scarce suffice for a livelihood are taxed."[1] The feeling of the Parliament was so strong both against the Sicilian war and the methods taken to extort money, that it refused to grant any aid to the king, taking the ground that it had not been properly summoned according to the provisions of Magna Charta.[2]

7. The clergy nevertheless remained liable for the three years' tithe which had been granted by the Pope, and which Rustand was employed in raising. The remonstrances offered had some small effect in inducing the Papal envoy to withdraw some of his more oppressive regulations,[3] but there was no relaxation of the claim.

[1] *Annal. de Burton, Ann. Monast.*, i. 360-63.

[2] Matt. Paris, p. 913.

[3] See *Annal. de Burton, Ann. Monast.*, i. 363.

As, however, the clergy felt profoundly dissatisfied at the purposes for which their money was being employed,[1] and were encouraged in resistance by the general opinion of the country, doubtless every means was used to evade payment, and the money came in but slowly. In order to help forward the collection, and to obtain money if possible from other sources, such as aids, legacies, vacant churches, lapses, fines for non-residence, pluralities, etc., the Archbishop of Messina was sent in 1256 to support the work of Rustand; and at the same time it was intimated that the Pope had continued the three years' tithe for an additional two years, and the clergy were invited to make composition for this.[2] The Archbishop of Messina appeared in the Parliament on Mid-Lent Sunday (1257), but his requests for aid were received with a general chorus of grievances.[3] The King then appealed in woeful guise to the Convocation of the clergy. He had incurred a debt to the Pope of 135,000 marks. This he declared (though quite falsely) had been done with the consent of the clergy. He prays the clergy to take this debt upon them, and in addition to the five years' tithe, to grant him the five first years' fruits of vacant benefices; half the revenues of non-residents; in the case of those who were privileged to hold many benefices, the revenues of all their benefices but one; and the goods of deceased persons which had not been clearly devised. These modest demands were met by the prelates and clergy with the remonstrances to which they

[1] A contemporary poem expresses vividly the bitter feelings of the clergy—

'Ja fu cleregie
franche e desus,
Amée e cherie
nule nen pot plus.
Ore est enservie,
e trop envilie,
e abatu jus.
Par iceus est hunie
Dunt dut aver aïe
je n'os dire plus.
Li rois ne l'apostoile ne
pensent altrement
Mes coment au clers tolent lur
or e lur argent.
Co est e tute la summe
ke la Pape de Rume
Al rei trop consent,
pur aider sa curune
la dimi de clers li dune,
De ço en fet sun talent," etc.

Political Songs (Ed. Wright, Camden Soc.), p. 44.

[2] *Annal. de Burton, Ann. Monast.*, i. 388. At the same time heavy procurations were demanded of the clergy for the support of the archbishop. See Matt. Paris, p. 944.

[3] *Ann. Monast.*, i. 387.

had now become familiar. They had never consented to the outlay, they said. They had nothing except what was of the patrimony of the Crucified One. This, which belonged to the poor, they could not give to kings to carry on war with, without sin.[1] Nevertheless the clergy ended by offering to the king a sum of 52,000 marks in complete discharge of all extraordinary papal claims (quas gratias vocant), and on condition of the Church of England being henceforth free. The king took time to consider whether he would accept this offer.[2]

8. In August (1257) another meeting of Convocation was summoned by Archbishop Boniface to consider the state of affairs. The King had not sent an answer whether he would accept the 52,000 marks in discharge of all extra claims. Should a message be sent to him to know his decision? Should a message be sent to the Apostolic See to know whether the Pope would ratify the arrangement? What steps ought to be taken to resist lay encroachments? The King had prohibited the meeting of the Convocation on the archbishop's summons. This prohibition they would of course not heed,[3] but it might require some consideration.[4] On these grounds the clergy were called to meet in Synod in London. On this occasion there were no proctors for the beneficed clergy summoned, but the archdeacons were charged to obtain procuratorial letters from the clergy to enable them to act for them. The Convocation decided that a message ought to be sent to the King to know his decision. Also that messengers ought to be sent to the Pope to represent to him the grievances under which the English Church was labouring—a measure which they take shame to themselves for not having resorted to

[1] *Ann. Monast.*, i. 390-91.

[2] *Ib.*, i. 402. Matt. Paris (p. 951) says 42,000, and that the sum was granted "in enormem ecclesiæ et regni læsionem et jacturam irrestaurabilem." This seems to be about the earliest record of a Convocation proper—that is to say, a Synod of the clergy without admixture of laymen—summoned by the archbishop.

[3] An liceat et expediat de negotiis ecclesiæ tractare, vel potius *quod absit*, prohibitioni regiæ parere.—*Ann. Monast.*, i. 403.

[4] *Ann. Monast.*, i. 402.

before.[1] The Synod then proceeds to the consideration of special grievances relating to the clashing of the secular and ecclesiastical jurisdictions, and the alleged hardships which the clergy had to suffer from lay officials.[2]

9. The clergy displaying this strenuous resistance to parting with their money, the Pope determined to use yet more vigorous measures. In the beginning of the year 1258 he despatched his envoy, Herlot, to England, armed with the fullest powers for excommunication and interdict. His anger was now aroused against the King for his feebleness in not exacting money from his subjects, and he threatened him with excommunication and interdict.[3] The plan was now adopted, not of demanding money under the threat of excommunication, but of inflicting the excommunication and interdict first, in order to save time, and only taking them off when the money was paid.[4] Heavy procurations and aids were thus exacted from the abbeys and the clergy; and what with these and the indefinite responsibilities to which many were committed by the treachery of the bishop of Hereford, and also the payment of the tithe, an absolute spoliation was being made of the revenues of the Church. Under these circumstances the archbishop summoned his Convocation to meet at Merton on St. Barnabas' Day (1258).

10. The first thing which engaged the attention of the clergy was the grievances which many of them were suffering from high-handed exercises of the lay power, the king using unscrupulously the agency of his officers to exact fines and bribes for illegal privileges. Evidently the clergy were being subjected to a deliberate system of persecution, resembling that used by John at the time of the Interdict, to punish them for their resistance to extortions, and to force money from them.[5] A bold stand is determined upon by the clergy. The weapon of excommunication was to be freely used, and against even the king himself if he persevere in his evil courses.[6] A paper of articles containing the highest hierarchical pretensions, formerly drawn up by

[1] *Ann. Monast.*, i. 404-5.
[2] *Ib.*, i. 406-7.
[3] Matt. Paris, p. 960.
[4] *Ann. Monast.*, i. 411.
[5] See *Ib.*, i. 413, *sq.*
[6] *Ann. de Burton, Ann. Monast.*, i. 418.

Bishop Grosseteste, was brought before the Convocation.[1] A long list of clerical privileges, compiled by Robert de Marisco, by the orders of Grosseteste, was also before them.[2] It does not appear what resolution was come to about the money claims; but, as the great assembly at Oxford, including the magnates of the whole realm as well as the clergy, was sitting about the same time, the matter was perhaps left for this more powerful body to handle.

11. The proceedings at the Parliament of Oxford were equivalent to a revolution. Power was almost taken out of the king's hand, his foreign dependants were put to flight, and the strong castles of the land were given into the hands of Englishmen. The barons addressed so vigorous a remonstrance to the Pope on the spoliations to which the Church had been subjected, that it drew from Pope Alexander a long apologetic letter. The Pope professed to rejoice at the interest and zeal displayed by the barons in religious matters; declared that the Papal See had sought only the good of the Church by its intrusion of foreigners into English benefices; is sorry to hear that they have not cared for their churches, but declares himself liable to be deceived like others; indulges in a somewhat fulsome panegyric of England and the saints and doctors which it has produced; declares that he by no means desires to rob the laity of their right of patronage, and that for the future he will take care that no scandals shall arise.[3]

12. That the papal disposal of English benefices thus feebly defended by the Pope was both utterly hateful to the people of the land, and not without danger to those who availed themselves of it, was shown by a tragical event which happened about this time. A prebend in St. Paul's Cathedral had been vacated by Rustand, who had assumed the vows of the regulars, and had been conferred by the Dean and Chapter on John de Crakhall, archdeacon of Bedford. Then came a certain Roman with the Pope's letters demanding the prebend; and, the Dean and Chapter yielding, he was installed in it on the first Thursday in Lent

[1] *Ann. Monast.*, i. 422; Gross., *Epist.*, p. 72.
[2] *Ann. Monast.* i. 425.
[3] *Annal. de Burton*, *Ann. Monast.*, i. 487-91.

(1259). But as he went out of the church, accompanied by two companions, the new prebendary was met by three young men altogether unknown to him, who fell upon him and murdered him close to the gate of the churchyard. His two terrified companions fled, but they were pursued, overtaken, and slain. This happened in mid-day, in the midst of numbers of people; but no one lifted a hand to prevent it, nor was any attempt made to capture the murderers, so intense and general was the hatred of the foreign intruders.[1]

13. The Provisions of Oxford offered a slight and temporary hope of a better condition of things between the king and the barons, but this hope was soon dispelled. The character of Henry gave no security for the maintenance of any obligations or promises. He procured from the Pope an absolution of himself from the promises which he had made. Fresh disputes arose. The arbitration of St. Louis in 1264 seemed to leave the barons no hope for the redress of their grievances, and open war ensued. In this war the clergy were for the most part strongly in favour of the baronial party, headed by Simon de Montfort. It would have been strange had it been otherwise. They had been vexed, pillaged, and spoiled for many years by the King, with the connivance of the Pope.[2] They had many special grievances to complain of in the unauthorised intrusions of the lay power into spiritual concerns. They had lost all reverence for popes who could deliberately oppress them by intrusions of aliens and every imaginable exaction, who could lightly absolve kings from solemn obligations, and whose policy seemed to be to follow up purposes of temporal ambition at the expense of the patrimony of the Church. In the eyes of the clergy Simon de Montfort was a hero, a saviour, even a worker of miracles. The chronicler describes him as going to the battle of Lewes "having justice and the fear of God before his eyes, choosing death rather than falsehood or dishonesty, being directed by the advice of bishops and religious men, a man to whom faith was as a shield, a soldier fighting the battles of the Lord." He is said to have

[1] *Annal. de Dunstaplid, Ann. Monast.*, iii. 214.

[2] "Papa et Rex velut Pastor et Lupus in ovium exterminium confederati, omnibus ruinam minabantur."—Matt. Paris, p. 917.

won the battle of Lewes by a direct miracle,[1] and throughout the monasteries and religious houses of England there was joy and rejoicing at the defeat and capture of the king (May 14, 1264). Another event greatly delighted the clergy. The man perhaps most hated in England, the treacherous and mischievous bishop of Hereford, had at the beginning of the war been captured by the barons and thrown into prison.[2]

14. The support lent by the prelates and clergy to the party of the barons drew upon them, as might be expected, the anger of the Pope. The Cardinal Ugo de Falcodi was despatched to England with a mighty retinue, charged to depose the bishops who favoured the barons, and to decree the outlawry of the barons who opposed the king. The times of John and Innocent seemed to have returned. But the popular party had now a more real power. The cardinal did not think it prudent to approach nearer to England than Boulogne ; to this place he summoned the bishops who supported the barons, viz. London, Worcester, Winchester, Chichester, Lincoln, Chester, Salisbury, and the elect of Bath.[3] It was no doubt convenient for the prelates summoned, and not displeasing to them, that the barons strictly forbade their leaving the country. They were compelled to send representatives to explain their unfortunate detention to the Legate, and to make their apologies. The cardinal was far from being satisfied. He raged against them, says a chronicler on the royal side, with great vehemence, and was for punishing them with the penalty prescribed by the canons.[4] The envoys were constrained to appeal to the Pope, or to a general council, on behalf of their masters and the whole clergy of England. Three of the bishops,

[1] *Ann. de Dunstap.*, *Ann. Monast.*, iii. 232. Some of the utterances as to Simon savoured of blasphemy ; thus :—

"Non sic venerabilis S. de Monte Forti,
Qui se Christi similis dat pro multis morti.
Nec fraus nec fallacia comitem promovit,
Sed divina gratia quæ quos juvet novit."

—*Polit. Songs* (C. S.), p. 89. [2] *Chron. W. de Rishanger*, p. 9.

[3] *Chron. de Dunstap.*, *Ann. Monast.*, iii. 234 ; *Chron. Thomæ Wykes*, *Ann. Monast.*, iv. 156 ; *Chron. W. de Rishanger*, p. 39.

[4] *Chron. Thomæ Wykes*, *u. s.*

after having shown this bold front, timidly yielded to the fear of the Pope's anathema, and secretly made their way into France. They were ordered by the Legate to excommunicate Simon de Montfort and his adherents, and to put London, the Cinque Ports, and other parts of the kingdom under an interdict. Having received the necessary documents, the prelates began their homeward voyage. Perhaps they had taken care that their journey and its purport should be not unknown to those principally interested; at any rate, they were seized at sea[1] by the sailors of the Cinque Ports, their papal documents torn to shreds and thrown into the water, and they themselves threatened with death if they should venture to promulgate any sentences such as had been committed to them by the Legate.[2]

15. A convincing proof of the general acceptance of the party of the barons by the clergy was afforded by the summonses issued to Simon de Montfort's Parliament. The Archbishop of York, the bishops of Durham and Carlisle, ten abbots and nine priors of the Northern Province, ten bishops and fifty-five abbots, twenty-six priors, four deans, and the heads of the military orders in the Southern, were invited to attend.[3] When, therefore, at the battle of Evesham (August 4, 1265) the party of the king triumphed and the great earl, the protector of the clergy, was slain, the clergy had heavy retribution to expect. In the following March (1266) Cardinal Othobon arrived as the papal Legate to inflict censure on the bishops who had favoured the barons. His arrival was marked by severe measures. All the towns through which he passed were placed under interdict, and he even ventured to inflict the same censure on the City of London.[4] The bishops who had been the chief offenders in supporting the barons were summoned before him—namely, Winchester, London, Lincoln, and Chichester—and were commanded to present themselves before the Pope on a certain day.[5] The opportunity of

[1] Sponte nescio vel invitè.—Wykes. [2] *Chron. T. Wykes, u. s.*

[3] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, ii. 93.

[4] *Ann. de Oseneiâ, Ann. Monast.*, iv. 180. The interdict was soon removed.

[5] *Ann. de Dunstap., Ann. Monast.*, iii. 240. One of them was wise

having the clergy at his mercy was not likely to be neglected by the king. Although the Legate exacted immoderate procurations, making each religious house, however small, pay six marks, yet the king must also have his share. He obtained a grant of a tenth for three years, whereby, says the chronicler, "the Church of England was terribly impoverished, and in many ways utterly exhausted."[1]

16. The Legate having thus amerced the clergy in their property, turned his attention to reforming their manners and caring for their discipline. In May 1268, at the church of St. Paul in London, he celebrated a legatine council, at which "the king, all the archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, and many nobles of England were present."[2] Here he set forth a valuable body of Constitutions, "very fruitful for the tranquillity of the Church, the state of the kingdom, and the welfare of religious men."[3] In the year 1261 Archbishop Boniface had promulgated a body of Constitutions at Lambeth, which are remarkable for the ultra-hierarchical tone in which they deal with lay invasions of the spiritual province.[4] The Constitutions of Othobon deal more generally with clerical duties. They are a comment upon the Constitutions of the Legate Otho set forth in the Council of London in 1237, and an enlargement of them. As a body of laws and rules they are extremely valuable, and are hardly surpassed by any similar document; and if the concluding direction given in them were carefully observed, and the bishops caused them to be read every year in their diocesan synods, they must have had a considerable influence in improving the state of the clerical body and the condition of the Church.[5]

enough to compound for a fine, and so escape this visit. The others had to suffer much hardship at Rome for many years. *Ann. Dunstap.*, 247; *Ann. de Oseneiâ*, *Ann. Monast.*, iv. 181.

[1] Barthol. de Cotton, p. 141

[2] *Ib.*, p. 140. This chronicler puts the Council in the wrong year and at the wrong place.

[3] *Ann. de Dunstap.*, *u. s.*

[4] See Johnson, *Eng. Canons*, ii. 182-210.

[5] *Ib.*, ii. 211-249. A short résumé of the Constitutions, which are of considerable length, will be found in Notes and Illustrations to this Chapter. It is said that the Legate was so frightened at the opposition which had been made to his predecessor Otho's Constitu-

17. The year 1269 witnessed the completion of Henry's rebuilding of the abbey church at Westminster, which is said by the chronicler, and not without good ground for the assertion, to have surpassed all the churches in Christendom then existing, and to have no peer.[1] But though the king's devotion was unquestionable, the reverence for holy things was not in those days universal. This period is remarkable for several outbreaks of popular feeling against monasteries. The way in which a religious house could urge its various claims, both temporal and spiritual, against civil communities, is well illustrated by the Dunstable Annals. These record a series of quarrels between the house of Austin canons established there and the town. At one time the burghers, rendered furious by repeated exactions, declared that they did not care for the excommunications; that they would rather go to the infernal regions than bear the exactions of the priory any longer, and they began to make serious preparations for deserting the town and building it on another spot.[2] The town here was but a small one, but in the case of larger and more important communities, the townsfolk sometimes took the law into their own hands with considerable effect. Under the year 1264, the Winchester Annals record that the townspeople "rose against the prior and convent of St. Swithun's, and burned the gate of the priory, and the gate called Kingate with the church of St. Swithun's above it, and all the buildings and property of the convent near the wall, and also slew some of the members of the priory wickedly within the enclosure of the monastery."[3] And a still more fierce rising against a monastic house is recorded by Bartholomew de Cotton. "In the year 1270, on the morrow of St. Lawrence, the citizens of Norwich surrounded the monastery, and not being able to force an entrance, applied fire to the great gates to which a parochial church was adjoining, and burnt them with the church and all

tions, that he would not enforce them himself, but left it to the bishops.—*Ann. T. Wykes*, p. 217.

[1] *Ann. Thomæ Wykes, Ann. Monast.*, iv. 227.

[2] *Ann. de Dunstaplia, Ann. Monast.*, iii. 122.

[3] *Ann. de Winton., Ann. Monast.*, ii. 101.

its contents. At the same time they applied fire to the great almshouse, to the gates of the (cathedral) church, to the great bell tower, all of which, together with the bells, were burned. They tried to fire other parts of the great church, but all were saved except the chapel of St. Mary. They burned the dormitory, the refectory, the guest-hall, the infirmary with its chapel, and almost all the buildings of the court. Very many belonging to the house, some of them sub-deacons, some clerks, some laymen, they slew in the cloister and within the precincts of the monastery; some they dragged out and put to death in the town; some they threw into prison. Entering into the monastery, they plundered all the sacred vessels, books, and vestments, which had not been consumed, and put to flight all the monks except two or three."[1] These violent and sacrilegious outbreaks, whatever may have been the special provocation which was the immediate cause of them, show that the feelings of reverence and submission to religious bodies on the part of laymen could not be altogether depended on.

18. The feelings which had been stirred up by the national struggle against the exactions and oppressions of the King, supported by the Pope, gradually calmed down. The latter years of the reign of Henry III. were comparatively quiet. By the "Dictum of Kenilworth" a committee was appointed of barons and prelates to arrange all matters of dispute.[2] The Church was declared to be free, as enacted in Magna Charta. The tenth of ecclesiastical revenues (except those of the exempt orders) which had been granted to the king for five years,[3] seems to have been quickly paid. A twentieth was also afterwards given. The clergy thus showed themselves not unwilling to contribute when their grievances were considered and the king no longer sought for their money for foolish schemes of foreign aggression. On November 16, 1272, died King Henry, after a long and turbulent reign, and was succeeded by his able son Edward, without the least show of opposition, although, at the time, the prince was absent in the Holy Land carrying on his

[1] Barthol. de Cotton, p. 147.
[2] *Ann. de Waverleiâ*, *Ann. Monast.*, ii. 372.
[3] *Ann. Winton.*, *Ann. Monast.*, ii. 104.

crusade. Henry, though a bad king, and utterly untrustworthy in his promises, yet had some good points in his character. He was amiable, chaste, and devout. The sway of such a ruler, though fruitful of public disturbances, might yet be favourable to the growth of private virtues; and men like Richard of Chichester, who by a life of unobtrusive devotion to his pastoral work earned for himself the title of saint,[1] may have been more plentiful than the chronicles might lead us to suppose. This, too, was the age of the early zeal and earnest work of the friars, and both Dominicans and Franciscans were labouring devotedly among the too-much-neglected masses. But the period is especially valuable as showing us the clergy first learning to take a national stand in direct opposition to the tyrannical dictation of the Pope; and some good seed was now sown which was to bear fruit afterwards. In the next chapter we shall see the condition of things altogether reversed. The clergy, misled by their primates, are found resisting the King and the State as the partisans of Rome. This leads to a vigorous attempt to curb their pretensions by law; and the nationality of the Church is now provided for by statutes, as against the will of the clergy, or at any rate that of some of the most prominent of their body.

[1] He was canonised in 1272. R. de Rishanger, *Chron.*, pp. 11, 12.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

THE CONSTITUTIONS OF CARDINAL OTHOBON.

1. Baptism to be administered at other times besides Easter and Whitsuntide. Priests to explain the form of baptism in the mother tongue, that, in case of necessity, lay persons may baptize.

2. The paying for sacraments to be strictly prohibited. Prisoners not to be hindered from confession.

3. Churches to be consecrated. A *Table* to be provided in churches.

4. Arms not to be borne by clerks.

5. Clerks to dress in a fitting habit, wearing close copes and the tonsure, and avoiding all lay equipments.

6. Clerks not to engage in secular employment, saving in the king's service.

7. Clerks not to act as pleaders in cases of blood.

8. Clerks to dismiss their concubines (or wives) within a month. The archdeacons to inquire. The concubine (or wife) to be prohibited from the sacraments.

9. No vicars to be admitted to cures except they be in priest's orders, or ready to be ordained.

10. No presentation to be made to a church except it be absolutely ascertained that it is vacant either by death or cession. [This constitution made to protect foreign incumbents.]

11. Churches not to be divided. Only one incumbent to be presented to any one church.

12. The privileges of sanctuary to be maintained. He who has taken sanctuary not to be debarred from receiving victuals.

13. Matrimony not to be hindered.

14. Wills to be religiously carried out.

15. Revenues of vacant churches not to be seized by the bishops.

16. Rectors to have rectorial rights over all chapels in their parishes.

17. Clergy not to suffer churches or glebe houses to run into dilapidation.

18. Procurations not to be exacted unless visitation is actually held.

19. Archdeacons not to allow a composition for grievous sins by money payment.

20. Dignities not to be farmed.

21. Bishops to reside on their Sees.

22. Vicars to be appointed to all appropriate livings. Houses of residence to be provided.

23. Goods of intestates not to be seized by bishop.

24. Causes to be judged by persons of dignity and repute.

25. Letters of summons to be sent by proper officers, and not by the party to the suit.

26. Advocates not to be admitted to plead without permission of diocesan.

27. Peaceful settlements of causes not to be obstructed.

28. Relaxations of sentences passed to be publicly notified.

29. Institution not to be given to immoral persons or to pluralists without dispensation.

30. Commendams not to be allowed.

31. Pluralists not to be promoted.

32. False resignations to be prevented.

33. No compact of payment to be made for a church.

34. Markets not to be held in churches.

35. Processions to be used on Trinity Monday.

36. These Constitutions to be read yearly in diocesan synods.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE NATIONALITY OF THE CHURCH FORTIFIED BY LAW.

1272-1353.

1. The Pope "provides" Robert Kilwardby as Primate. 2. Rise of the friars; difficulties with which Edward I. had to deal. 3. Archbishop Peccham. 4. Council of Reading. 5. First Statute of Mortmain. 6. The archbishop recedes from his claims. 7. He attacks the exempt orders. 8. The representation of the parochial clergy by proctors established. 9. The clergy show unwillingness to contribute for State purposes. 10. Statute of *Circumspectè agatis*. 11. The new valuation of clerical incomes. 12. A half of clerical incomes demanded. 13. The Parliamentary summons of the clergy. 14. Winchelsea archbishop; the bull *Clericis laicos*. 15. The clergy refuse to vote a subsidy, and are outlawed. 16. The King and Primate reconciled. 17. Renewed bitterness between the King and the clergy. 18. The Pope's bull relaxed; the clergy vote a contribution. 19. Importance of the struggle; interests of Pope and King separated. 20. The barons refuse to allow the King to plead before the Pope. 21. Winchelsea in disgrace; the King truckles to the Pope. 22. The Statute of Carlisle. 23. The Pope claims the right of reservation and provision to English Sees. 24. Walter Reynolds "provided" for the primacy. 25. Privileges granted by the Pope to the Primate. 26. The Statute *Articuli Cleri*. 27. Bishop Orlton tried in a secular court. 28. Bad character of the prelates of that day. 29. Primacy of Archbishop Mepham. 30. Quarrel between the king and Archbishop Stratford. 31. Edward determines to assert his rights in the matter of patronage. 32. Active measures taken against papal provisions. 33. Statute regulating clerical privileges. 34. Circumstances favourable to the enactment of a strict prohibition of Provisions. 35. First Statute of *Provisors*. 36. Effects of the Statute. 37. First Statute of *Præmunire*.

1. At the death of Archbishop Boniface abroad in 1270, the Canterbury monks had elected their prior Adam de Chillenden to the vacant See. Ever striving to make the primacy of the English Church a mere appanage of their monastery, they had refused to entertain the urgent requests of Prince Edward, who sought to obtain the promotion for "his clerk Robert Burnel," one of the best specimens of the secular clerk to be found in our Church

history. Edward, already embarked for the Crusade, had hastened back to Canterbury, thinking by his presence to overawe the monks. But he did not succeed, and the election of the prior Adam was completed.[1] Not content with this bold act of independent spirit, the convent of Canterbury proceeded to a still more audacious assumption of power. Their right at any rate to take part in the election of an archbishop was undoubted, but it was altogether a new and unheard-of claim that, during the vacancy of the metropolitan See, they should have the right of confirming the election of suffragan bishops, and giving forth their mandate for their consecration. This, however, they ventured to do in the case of Robert de Wichampton, elected bishop of Salisbury. The bishops having examined into the legality of the Canterbury claim, decided against it, and refused to consecrate.[2] Meantime Adam, archbishop-elect, proceeded to Rome, but there he did not find matters progress as smoothly as he might have desired. The Pope declined to confirm him, and recommended him to resign. To this Adam yielded, and the election was quashed.[3] The Pope did not deem it necessary to order another election, but, acting with the same arbitrary authority which some of his predecessors had used, appointed or "provided" brother Robert de Kilwardby, of the order of Friars Preachers, or Dominicans, to be the Primate of the English Church. The Pope allowed him to choose his consecrator from among the English bishops. He selected William de Bitton, bishop of Bath, who was famed for sanctity, and by him and eleven other suffragans of the See of Canterbury, Kilwardby was consecrated at Canterbury on the first Sunday in Lent 1272.[4]

[1] *Chron. Thomæ Wykes, Ann. Monast.*, iv. 236. The king was very angry and ordered the goods of the monks to be confiscated.—Barthol. de Cotton, p. 146.

[2] "Evocatis legum et canonum magistris totius regni peritioribus, quæstionem istam difficilem, an mandato capituli parendum fuisset, diligentissime disputari fecerunt; nec inveniebant in canone vel in jure probabiles rationes quibus compelli poterant ad parendum."—*Chron. T. Wykes, Ann. Monast.*, iv. 243.

[3] *Ann. de Winton., A. M.*, ii. 112; *Ann. de Dunstap., A. M.*, iii. 253.

[4] *Chron. W. de Rishanger*, p. 72 (Rolls Series).

2. The new archbishop enjoyed a very high character for learning and sanctity, but he was a dangerous Primate for the Church of England. Belonging to an order which stood outside the ordinary organisation of the Church, and, though highly popular as yet with the laity, hated alike by the secular clergy and the monks, it was clear that he would be thrown altogether into the arms of the author of his promotion and his most efficient supporter, the Pope. Kilwardby thus became, says Professor Stubbs, "the first of a series of primates who attempted to impress a new mark on the relations of Church and State in England."[1] When Kilwardby reached the primacy, the mendicant orders had attained to the very summit of their fame and popularity. At the Council of Lyons, which the archbishop attended shortly after his consecration (1274), the great Bonaventura, the most eloquent preacher of the Franciscan order, was present to charm the assembly with his eloquence; and one still greater, Thomas Aquinas, the most famous scholar and philosopher of the Dominicans, was on his way to attend the council when he was overtaken by death. So great was the popularity of the Friars, that new orders of them were continually springing up; and it was one of the works of the council to decree solemnly that no new orders should henceforth be formed, and to abolish the order of Friars of the Sac, which had attained considerable popularity. In addition to the Dominicans and Franciscans, the orders of Augustinians and Carmelites were allowed to remain, but besides these four there were to be no other orders intruded on the Church.[2] There was probably no single cause which tended so directly to the denationalising of churches and to the exaltation of the monarchical power

[1] *Const. Hist.*, ii. 105. At the Council of Lyons, Kilwardby thus addressed the Pope: "Pater Sancte, opus et creatio manuum vestrarum ego sum, ecclesia mea ecclesia vestra et bona mea bona vestra sunt; disponite ergo de ecclesiâ meâ et de bonis meis, sicut et de bonis propriis."—W. Hemingburgh, *Chron.*, ii. 3.

[2] *Ann. de Dunstaplia, A. M.*, iii. 260. Rishanger says, "Aliquos status de ordinibus mendicantium approbavit, utpote Predicatores et Minores; aliquos toleravit, utpote Karmelitas et Augustinienses; aliquos reprobavit, ut Saccinos qui intitulantur 'de Pœnitentiâ' sive 'de Valle Viridi,' et consimiles" (p. 81).

claimed by Rome, as the rise and popularity of the Friars. And when one of this order reached the highest position of command and influence in the English Church, an element of mischief was introduced which was not slow to show itself in its consequences. The able king who had now succeeded to the throne could see clearly that if the chief places of power and influence in the Church were to be under the immediate control of Rome, there would be needed an especial care and vigilance lest the vast property held by Churchmen should be altogether exempted from State burdens, and thus the power of the Crown be seriously impaired. It became therefore a settled part of the policy of Edward I., on the one hand, to check the acquisition of property by the Church, and on the other, to make ecclesiastical revenue contribute its fair proportion to State burdens. This was one of the great struggles of his reign, and in carrying it on he was specially hampered by the principles of those who occupied the place of Archbishops of Canterbury. Had Burnel succeeded to the primacy, as Edward so much desired, the strife would have been far easier for the king. But the primates who were actually raised to the headship of the Church had no sympathy with the State policy of the king. They looked to Rome for inspiration, and opposed the king's demands, not as national Churchmen refusing to be unfairly taxed for alien objects to which they had given no approval, but as maintaining the principle that Church property was to be held free from all State burdens, however just in themselves and legally imposed, without the sanction of the Pope. At the first outset of his reign the Council of Lyons had granted to the king a tenth of ecclesiastical revenue for six years, but this was upon the ground of the expenses which he had incurred in his Crusade.[1] The king, however, would not be always able to plead the merits of a Crusade, nor obtain a favourable consideration from popes and councils.

[1] *Ann. Dunstap.*, *A. M.*, iii. 260.—The Dean of Lincoln, Richard de Mapham, described by Hemingburgh as *Magnus ille philosophus*, opposed this grant with much spirit, and was deprived by the Pope of his benefices, but afterwards restored.—W. de Hemingburgh, *Chron.*, ii. 3.

It was the great object of Edward's administration to introduce order and regularity into the institutions of the country, and this evidently could not be done if the aids of the clergy were to be exceptional and optional, and not such as could be counted upon with certainty beforehand. Edward at once endeavoured to put the policy of restraining the acquisition of property by the Church into practice. It is said by Rishanger that in the first Parliament (1275), the king "published statutes against the Dead Hand, that for the future no possessions of lands or rents should devolve to the Dead Hand without the special license of the king."[1] But it does not appear that any Statute of Mortmain was actually passed in 1275. This was rather the foreshadowing of the royal policy and the expression of its aims.

3. The struggle which the king evidently anticipated did not commence in the time of Archbishop Kilwardby. This prelate was either too timid or too indolent to place himself in opposition to the king, but in the year 1278 Kilwardby was honourably relieved of his post by being made a cardinal and bishop of Porto.[2] Edward now made another earnest attempt to obtain the promotion of his friend and minister, Robert Burnel, bishop of Bath. But though he procured his election at Canterbury, the Pope deliberately quashed the election, and appointed by his own authority John de Peccham, a Franciscan friar[3]—a man like his predecessor distinguished for learning, but a man by virtue of his order standing apart from the Church of England, and imbued with thoroughly papal principles. His appointment was an act of arbitrary authority of the Pope, but Edward acquiesced in it as it was important for him to have the papal influence still on his side for the collection of the clerical subsidy, not yet paid.[4] To the

[1] *Chron.*, p. 85.

[2] The chronicler Thomas Wykes says, "Licet Cantuariensis archiepiscopatus in proventibus temporalium commodorum Portuense fastigium incomparabiliter excedere videretur, tamen ne summo Pontifici videretur inobediens, ditiori sponsæ, venustioris formæ captus illecebrâ, valedicens, temporalibus commodis non recusavit anteponere dignitatem."—*A. M.*, iv. 277.

[3] Rishanger, *Chron.*, p. 93.

[4] Hook, *Archbishops of Canterbury*, iii. 237.

policy of the new archbishop the king, however, soon opposed a decided resistance.

4. Peccham was not inclined, like his predecessor, to let the claims of the Church lie dormant. His first act in England after his consecration was to stir up the ancient strife between the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, his next, to summon by his own authority a council at Reading (1279), where he enunciated the strongest ecclesiastical claims. The *Constitutions* of this council take the form of a comment upon those of the Legate Othobon, which are generally enforced and adopted without much alteration. But certain cases were specified as falling within the meaning of the general excommunication pronounced against all opposers of Holy Church, which quickly brought the archbishop and his proceedings within the royal displeasure. Among these were "those who obtain letters in any lay court to obstruct ecclesiastics in such causes as by the canons belong to any ecclesiastical court." "Those who maliciously neglect to execute the mandates of our lord the king for taking up excommunicates, or who hinder their being taken, or unjustly procure their enlargement contrary to the decrees of ecclesiastical discipline." "Those who take away, consume, or injuriously lay their hands upon anything that belongs to the houses, manor, or granges of ecclesiastical persons." [1] These anathemas were thought, not without reason, to be directed against the king's officers. Consequently, the king complained to the Parliament, assembled at Michaelmas, of this infringement of his royal rights, and the archbishop was compelled to declare that the excommunications did not apply to the king's officers. He was also obliged to direct that the copies of Magna Charta which he had directed to be fastened up in churches should be taken down.[2]

5. But, not content with compelling the archbishop to

[1] Johnson, *Eng. Canons*, ii. 257-8.

[2] *Revocat. provis^m. Conc. Reding.* Wilkins, *Concil.*, ii. 40. This Council of Reading is remarkable for having confirmed and settled the representation of the parochial clergy in Convocation by proctors. For the history of the various forms of summoning the clergy, see Notes and Illustrations to this Chapter.

withdraw some of his most obtrusive claims, the king now proposed to Parliament as a statute that which had been in his mind some years before, but which the attitude of the new archbishop probably hastened—the Statute of Mortmain—the first statutory check to the power of the Church,[1]—and, under the relations which the National Church had now entered into with the Pope, a curb also on the influence of Rome. The statute now passed was entitled *De viris religiosis.* It recited that it was of old time the law that religious men should not enter upon fees without the license of the lord in chief, but that this was now commonly done to the detriment of the provision for the defence of the kingdom, and to the loss of the lord in chief; wherefore it provided "that no religious person or any other whatsoever should presume to buy or sell any lands or tenements, or under pretence of donation, or grant, or any other title whatsoever, to receive such from any one; or by any method, art, or skill, to appropriate them in such a way as whereby such lands and tenements should devolve in any manner to the dead hand." If any such transference to the dead hand were made, then the lord in chief should have the power of entering and seizing the fee.[2] It is clear that by the transfer of estates held for feudal service to religious bodies, which could render no military service, and from which pecuniary aids were with difficulty extracted, the Crown was a direct loser. Hence this statute, which checked the acquisition of wealth by ecclesiastical bodies. The king also, whose policy was to bring the taxing power of the State and its sources of revenue under one distinct and uniform control, obtained from this same Parliament sanction for demanding a fifteenth of ecclesiastical revenue, as the Parliament of 1275 had given him a fifteenth of lay revenue. This demand of the king was considered by the clergy of both provinces in

[1] It had been enacted in 1259 that no religious person should be allowed to acquire land without the license of the next lord from whom the donor held it, but this had not been enrolled, and it lacked the penal clause and the inducement to the next lord to enter. It was consequently inoperative. See Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, ii. 113.

[2] *Opus Chronicorum* (Rolls Series), p. 45; Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 448.

their provincial synods. The archbishop and clergy of York agreed to give a fifteenth for three years. The Primate at first showed considerable reluctance to yield to the demand, but at length, "compelled by the earnestness of the king," agreed to a tenth for two years, "that at least," says the chronicler, "he might be in something different from York." [1]

6. How great the grievance of the Statute *De religiosis* was felt to be is shown by the way in which the clergy constantly recurred to it afterwards in urging their rights. The archbishop no doubt felt that he had received a check, but he was not disposed to yield at once to the controlling power of the State. He summoned his Convocation to meet at Lambeth in October 1281, and prepared to make a vigorous reply to the king's measures. In the meantime writs of *Quo warranto* had been issued to inquire closely into the tenure of fees, whether they had been illegally transferred to religious persons, and whether those who professed to have freehold had really acquired it,[2] so that the clergy met the archbishop at Lambeth [3] in some anxiety as to their tenures. A bold front was assumed by the archbishop. Under his direction the synod voted that the king's courts had no right of inquisition in the case of patronage, and no right to intervene in causes touching the chattels of the spiritualty.[4] But these were matters which the king was not at all prepared to give up to exclusive ecclesiastical control. In all matters of property in which the interests of laymen as well as clergy might probably be involved, he claimed the right for the king's courts to have cognisance. It was something of the old dispute of Henry and Becket, but Archbishop Peccham was not a Becket. The king threatened him with unpleasant consequences if he should venture to do anything against the rights of the crown, and the archbishop, "terrified, abandoned his presumption." [5]

[1] *Ann. de Oseneiâ; Ann. T. Wykes; Ann. Monast,* iv. 286.

[2] *Ann. de Waverleiâ, A. M.,* ii. 395.

[3] For the Constitutions published at this Synod of Lambeth, see Notes and Illustrations to this Chapter.

[4] *Chron. Thomæ Wykes, A. M.,* iv. 285. [5] *Ib.*

7. Peccham seems to have consoled himself for this discomfiture by a very violent letter against the members of the exempt orders who had declined to attend his synod. They held themselves free, he says, like asses' colts; they had no feeling for the troubles of their holy mother; they were like Hagar, who despised her mistress; therefore the bishops of the province are straitly charged to inflict upon them what punishment they can, viz. to put all the non-exempt churches which are appropriated to exempt monasteries under strict sequestration, preventing any revenue to be paid by them to the religious house, or any religious offices to be done in them. From this singular method of punishing the exempt order a chorus of appeals at once went up to Rome.[1] In the conduct of the archbishop may be traced not only his bitterness at having been defeated by the firmness of the king, but also the fierce antagonism which existed between friars and monks, who cordially hated one another. It is difficult to estimate which party was the more likely to find favour at Rome—the friars, the new and efficient champions of the Holy See—or the exempt orders, the old favourites of the popes.

8. The king, in pursuance of the policy on which he was now earnestly bent—of making the clergy amenable to the financial needs of the State equally with the laity—in place of holding a Parliament, summoned, in 1282, two provincial councils, to which both clergy and laity were called. The sheriffs were to summon the laity, the archbishops the clergy. In the writ directed to Archbishop Peccham he is bid to summon his suffragans, the abbots and heads of religious houses, and the proctors of the deans and chapters, but no mention is made of the parochial clergy and their proctors.[2] This was a fatal omission, for, on the assembling of the clerical body at Northampton

[1] *Ann. de Waverleiâ, A. M.*, ii. 395-6-7. The archbishop was excessively severe upon the character of the clergy of his day. He says, "The Church of England hath long been plagued with false clerks, who, for worldly glory and out of covetousness, heaping benefice upon benefice, contrary to canon and without the Pope's dispensation, destroy souls purchased with the blood of the Redeemer, and lead an infamous life."—Johnson, *Eng. Canons*, ii. 299. [2] *Select Charters*, p. 456.

(January 1283), and a demand of a subsidy being made of them, it was immediately replied that they were an imperfect body, and could not grant a subsidy because of the absence of the representatives of the parochial clergy.[1] Of this excuse the assembled prelates readily availed themselves, and the clerical assembly was dissolved without doing anything for the king's needs. The archbishop, however, immediately summoned another Convocation for May 9, in which, *for the first time*, the bishops are distinctly directed to bring *two representatives* of the clergy from each diocese, who shall be sufficiently informed of the minds of their brethren in a diocesan meeting to be held previously, and thus able to vote for "the honour of the Church, the comfort of our lord the king, and the peace of the kingdom."[2]

9. This Convocation, which was prorogued till the autumn, probably to give the Diocesan Synods time to express their minds, did in fact grant the king a twentieth.[3] But this subsidy was granted very unwillingly, and with a full statement of the clerical grievances. The clergy, by the mouth of their proctors, declared that, owing to bad harvests, the change in the coinage, the loss of cattle, and the taxes levied on them for the king and the Crusade, the Church was so impoverished, that its revenues did not suffice to support its ordinary burdens, and to find maintenance for its ministers, so that in very many places there was a woeful falling short of the supply of ministers. A fifteenth had lately been given to the king, the whole of which was not yet paid, and many of the prelates had made special contributions. There had been no relief in the matter of prohibitions to ecclesiastical courts, so that mother Church was sunk so low that scarce any one now

[1] This argument would seem to establish beyond doubt that the representation of the parochial clergy had been secured by a canon passed at the Council of Reading, 1279, as supposed by Hody (iii. 138), although Mr. Stubbs holds that the canon was not passed until the holding of the assembly which availed itself of it.

[2] *Select Charters*, p. 457.

[3] *Ann. de Dunstap.*, *Ann. Monast.*, iii. 299; Barthol. de Cotton, p. 165. Rishanger (p. 103) says a fifteenth, and afterwards a thirtieth.

feared the power of the Keys. A new demand might soon be expected from the Pope, the Roman Church being now subject to unheard-of oppressions, so that the clergy could not venture to promise anything to the King unless the sovereign Pontiff should have been first consulted. The clergy finally acknowledge that there are certain cases in which they may be justly called to contribute to the King's needs, but this must always be done under the advice and direction of the chief Pontiff.[1] This complete change of tone from that which distinguished the clergy in the previous reign, and the open profession that, even in cases of extreme need, they were not prepared to grant a subsidy to the King except with the consent of the Pope, must needs have tended to exasperate the King against the clerical body in a way which the grudging contribution they at length bestowed hardly availed to remove.

10. Constant complaints had been made by the clergy, both in this reign and the preceding reign, that they were drawn into secular courts to plead on matters which belonged properly to the spiritual courts, that the processes of the courts-spiritual were hindered by prohibitions, and that ecclesiastical jurisdiction was continually and rudely interfered with. In 1285 the clergy of the Southern Province presented a petition to the king, praying that these prohibitions should no longer be allowed, and that the courts-Christian should be permitted to exercise their proper jurisdiction without interference.[2] The whole matter was fully debated between the Chancellor, as representing the lay power, and the clergy, and the result was the issuing of a writ by the king, known as the writ "*Circumspectè agatis*," which was afterwards adopted as a statute (13 Edward I., st. iv., c. 1), and became the authoritative settlement of this matter which had been so long in dispute. This statute recognises the right of the clergy "to hold pleas on matters merely spiritual, such as offences for which penance was due, tithes, mortuaries, churches and churchyards, injuries done to clerks, perjury, and defamation."[3]

[1] *Ann. Dunstap.*, *Ann. Monast.*, iii. 295.
[2] Wilkins, ii. 119. [3] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, ii. 119.

11. The Statute of *Circumspectè agatis* may have been a fair and equitable settlement of a troublesome dispute, but it was not regarded with favour by the clergy, who desired to have the right to judge in all matters wherein a clerk was in any way mixed up. Nor were the relations between the King and the Church mended by the grant of a tenth of ecclesiastical revenue for six years which Edward obtained in 1291.[1] This grant, which was nominally for a Crusade, was conceded by Pope Nicholas IV., and thus the most papal of the clergy could not object to it on principle; but it pressed upon many with peculiar bitterness, as it was founded on a new and very severe valuation of all ecclesiastical property. The two chief valuers were John, bishop of Winchester, and Oliver, bishop of Lincoln. These prelates appointed deputies in each of the dioceses. The chronicler complains bitterly of these new taxers, who, "incomparably exceeding the insolence of the old officers, valued property much more heavily than it was wont to be rated, and even thus could not extinguish the inextinguishable avarice of the heart of the King."[2] The Pope's Bulls granted not only a tenth of ecclesiastical estates, but also of all obventions and offerings. The sums arising from all these sources were safely hoarded and kept in the monasteries until the king should set out on his Crusade. But the king, finding this money within his reach, rudely seized it without giving any care for the purpose for which it was collected.[3] Another Bull specified minutely such of the poorer ecclesiastical corporations (as the houses of lepers, the nuns who lived by charity, the secular clergy who had less than six marks a year), which were to be exempted from the tax.[4]

12. While the clergy were still groaning under the

[1] The Bull, dated in the fourth year of the Pontificate of Nicholas IV., is given in Bartholomew de Cotton, p. 189; and Hemingburgh, ii. 26. Another tenth (for one year), grounded on the old valuation of Walter, bishop of Norwich, was given to the king by the clergy in the year 1290.—Barthol. de Cotton, p. 178.

[2] *Ann. de Oseneiâ, Ann. Monast.*, iv. 333.

[3] W. de Hemingburgh, ii. 26, 53; Barthol. de Cotton, p. 187.

[4] Barthol. de Cotton, p. 191.

sharp pressure of the payment of the tenth under the new and greatly increased taxation, another blow came upon them from the king, which was indeed a crushing one. Involved in a war with France, and driven to the utmost extremities for want of funds, Edward determined to assail without scruple, and to an extent never before attempted, the revenues of the clergy. There was then no Archbishop of Canterbury. Peccham had died in 1292, and the Pope had not yet confirmed the election of his successor. The King therefore himself summoned the clergy to a Convocation, or rather a general synod, as both provinces were to meet together at Westminster, and the inferior clergy were to be represented by elected proctors.[1] The clergy assembled accordingly on St. Matthew's day (September 21, 1294), and the king explained to them his necessities. Then Oliver Sutton, bishop of Lincoln, asked for time to deliberate. The king conceded three days. At the expiration of this time the counsels were still various. There was no one to lead the Canterbury prelates, and John Romanus, Archbishop of York, was in great terror, as he owed the king a large sum, and was afraid to take an open part against him. The consultation ended by their offering to the king two tenths, to be paid in one year.[2] The king at once informed them that nothing less than a half of their revenues would be accepted. The clergy were struck with terror. The dean of St. Paul's is said to have died with fright in the king's presence. But the Upper House of the Convocation, awed by the presence of the king and his threats of outlawry, at length yielded to the demand. The proctors of the clergy in the Lower House were more obstinate. Feeling that they had not only their own interests, but also those of their brethren in charge, they stoutly resisted. It was not until the king had sent a band of soldiers to them to threaten them with outlawry, and to call upon any one who refused to pay to

[1] Barthol. de Cotton, p. 247.

[2] W. de Hemingburgh, *Chron.*, ii. 56. Speaking of John Romanus, the archbishop, the chronicler says, "Bene Romanus, quia a Romano patre Romanam cupiditatem extraxit—sitivit valde pecuniam et substantiam aliorum."—Hemingburgh, ii. 70.

stand forth and declare himself, that the lower clergy at length yielded. In return they received a protection from the king, securing their goods and cattle from forcible seisure for the king's use.[1]

13. King Edward had found the taxation of the clergy a valuable source of revenue, but he had also found it attended with considerable difficulty and risk in the obtaining. He could not always expect to find a complaisant Pope who would grant him tenths for a Crusade which never was carried out, nor could he always hope to be able to intimidate the clergy, as he had lately done when they were without a head and leader. His politic mind therefore devised a plan for bringing the inferior clergy into the Parliament by representation, as the spiritual peers already sat there by virtue of their prelatical dignity. In the writs issued for the meeting of the Parliament of 1295, the bishops are premonished to appear both by themselves and by the heads of their chapters, their archdeacons, one proctor for each chapter, and two for the clergy of each diocese. The archbishop, bishops, and clergy of the Northern Province, sixty-seven abbots, and the heads of the exempt orders, are similarly summoned to Westminster, save that in the case of the abbots the premonishing clause (*præmunientes*) is not inserted in the writ.[2] It is evident that this summons of the clergy, and the assembly which resulted from it, differed altogether from the ecclesiastical summons to a sacred synod or Convocation, and from that assembly when met. It was a summons of the clergy in their secular aspect simply for taxing purposes.

14. To the See of Canterbury had now succeeded Robert Winchelsea, archdeacon of Essex, who had been first selected by the king, and then chosen unanimously by the Chapter of Canterbury. After a considerable delay, caused by the vacancy of the See of Rome, Winchelsea had been consecrated in Italy, and enthroned at Canterbury with extraordinary magnificence, the king himself being present at the ceremonial.[3] But though selected by the

[1] Barthol. de Cotton, p. 249. [2] See the Writ, *Select Charters*, p. 474.

[3] See the minute account given in Dr. Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops*, vol. iii. chap. vii.

King, and specially honoured by him at his inauguration as Primate, the new archbishop proved anything but tractable in the matter of the royal policy for the taxation of the clergy. There was now on the throne of St. Peter one of the most ambitious and daring of the Popes who had ever occupied it. The policy of Boniface VIII. was to assert and retain a complete control over all clerical revenues, and by means of this power to hold in check all the princes who could not afford to do without financial help from the vast estates then owned by Churchmen. He was thus brought into collision with two of the most energetic and able kings who ever reigned in Europe—Philip the Fair in France, and Edward I. in England. In the strife which ensued in England the Primate lent himself unreservedly to the side of the Pope, and was thus involved in sharp antagonism with the King. At the meeting of the Parliament in the winter of 1295, the clergy, under the archbishop's direction, consented, after long delay, to grant a tenth, the king having demanded of them a third, or at least a fourth.[1] But in the following spring (February 24, 1296) came forth from the Pope the famous Bull, known as *Clericis Laicos*, which commanded the clergy not to pay, and the secular powers not to exact, under penalty of excommunication, any contributions from the revenues or goods of churches and clergy.[2]

15. The effects of this papal prohibition were soon apparent. At the Parliament held at Bury St. Edmund's, November 3, 1296, the king demanded a subsidy from the clergy. The archbishop, calling together the clergy who were in attendance on the Parliament, laid before them four points—(1.) Had any promise been made, as the king asserted, that the clergy would grant a subsidy? (2.) Did not the new papal edict completely bind them not to give a subsidy? (3.) Was there any imminent danger to the realm from France? (4.) Were not the clergy grievously impoverished by previous exactions?[3] The clergy were divided into four houses to consider these points. In the

[1] Barthol. de Cotton, p. 299.

[2] W. de Hemingburgh, *Chron.*, ii. 113; Knyghton, *De Eventibus Angliæ* (Ed. Twysden), p. 2489.

[3] Barthol. de Cotton, p. 314.

first were the archbishop and bishops, with the proctors of the absent bishops. In the second, the abbots and priors and representatives of religious houses. In the third, the deans, archdeacons, and other dignitaries. In the fourth, the proctors of the parochial clergy. Deliberations and mutual consultations occupied many days, but no way was discovered of meeting the demands of the King without running counter to the orders of the Pope. The archbishop then petitioned the King for delay, and was allowed to postpone his final answer to the feast of St. Hilary next following. The Primate accordingly summoned his Convocation to meet in London, January 13, 1297.[1] Here the deliberation was resumed with anxious earnestness for many days. The king sent deputies to the Convocation, who, when by the command of the Primate the Pope's Bull was read in the assembly, openly threatened the clergy, that if they did not give, the King would take. After a long time fruitlessly consumed in discussion, the clergy determined to try the effect of a deputation to the King to explain how they were fettered by the Pope's ordinance.[2] The only answer which Edward vouchsafed was, "If you will not observe the homage and oath which you have made for your baronies, I am entirely absolved from all obligation towards you." The Synod of Canterbury, however, still refused to yield, and in consequence were put out of the protection of the law.[3] Their property was at once seized by the king's officers. The horses which had brought them to the synod were appropriated.[4] The

[1] W. de Hemingburgh, *Chron.*, ii. 116. The archbishop-elect of York with his clergy assembled at the same place and time.

[2] The archbishop proposed that the king's deputies should explain this, but they declined, and said, "Ordinate ex vobis, domini charissimi, personas certas qui talia domino regi ex parte vestrâ renuncient; nos enem scientes indignationem ejus accensam veremur omnino talia renunciare."—Hemingburgh, *Chron.*, ii. 117.

[3] The Justitiary (Mellingham) declared from the bench—"Vos domini attornati archiepiscorum, episcoporum, etc., nunciate dominis, vestris et dicite quod de cetero in curiâ domini regis nulla fiet eis justitia de quacunque re, etiam si illata fuerit eis injuria atrocissima, justitia tamen de eis fiet omnibus conquerentibus et eam habere volentibus."—Hemingburgh, *Chron.*, ii. 117. [4] Barthol. de Cotton, p. 322.

sheriffs were ordered to make an inventory of all clerical estates, and if the clergy should not yield before Easter the whole were to be confiscated to the king's use.[1]

16. These violent measures sufficed at once to reduce the Archbishop-elect of York and the clergy of the Northern Province.[2] They agreed to the subsidy, and received letters of protection on February 6. Many also of the bishops and clergy of the Southern Province did the like. Others, however, resisted, thereby subjecting themselves to all sorts of insults and oppressions.[3] The Archbishop of Canterbury summoned his Convocation to meet again on March 10. The same method of deliberation was observed, and with the same result. The king sent a message to the clergy to say that he did not care for their subsidy, but that he was determined to make them pay heavily for their contumacy and disloyalty.[4] The archbishop looked anxiously to the Pope in hope of succour, but no aid came, and as the day of grace was nearly expired, he recommended the clergy to make terms for themselves.[5] As for himself, he utterly refused to yield, and in this determination he was joined by Oliver Sutton, bishop of Lincoln, and some others.[6] Upon this there was issued a letter to the sheriffs, ordering them to sell publicly the goods and chattels of the prelates, religious persons, and all clerks having a benefice exceeding in value forty shillings a year, who had not obtained the king's protection at Easter; to pay the money into the treasury, and to retain in their hands, and occupy for the king's use, the lands and property of such recusants.[7]

[1] Hemingburgh, ii. 118; *Ann. de Dunstaplid*, *Ann. Monast.*, iii. 405; Barthol. de Cotton, 318.

[2] They resorted to the subterfuge of putting their contributions in a church, which the king's officers afterwards took away.—Hemingburgh, ii. 118; Knyghton, p. 2492 (Ed. Twysden).

[3] *Ann. de Dunstap., u.s.* [4] *Ib.*

[5] "Universos et singulos propriis conscientiis vos dimitto. Sed mea conscientia pro regis protectione vel alio colore dare pecuniam non permittet."—*Ann. de Wigornid*, *Ann. Monast.*, iv. 531.

[6] W. de Hemingburgh, *Chron.*, ii. 118; Barthol. de Cotton, p. 323; *Ann. de Dunstaplid*, *Ann. Monast.*, iii. 407. MS. Regist. Oliveri Sutton (Linc.)

[7] Barthol. de Cotton, p. 324. Hemingburgh says of the archbishop

Edward I. was an able prince, but his methods of compassing what he held to be salutary were sometimes overbearing and tyrannical, and served to evoke a spirit of resistance. The bold stand made at this moment against his arbitrary measures by some of the barons convinced the king that he must be more conciliatory to the clergy, who were acting, as they believed themselves solemnly obliged to act, in refusing their contributions. Accordingly, on July 14 (1297), he was publicly reconciled to the archbishop in somewhat of a melodramatic fashion. The Primate received back his property, and undertook to summon his Convocation for August, and again to consult them as to a subsidy for the king.

17. On August 10 the Convocation met. The archbishop put four points to the clergy. (1.) Was it lawful for them to contribute to the king's needs? (2.) If so, what ought their contribution to be? (3.) What privileges ought they to demand in return? (4.) Had the king any special need for their help? That such a question as the first could be put to an English synod, and in face of all the precedents and practice of so many hundred years, is surprising. Still more surprising is it to find the clergy coming to a formal decision, that whatever the King's need might be they could not contribute without the leave of the Pope, and adding to this a request that the Pope's leave might be sought. To such an answer there could be but one reply on the part of a spirited prince like Edward. He had desired and sought reconciliation. He was ready to admit that he had been arbitrary in outlawing the clergy merely for their reluctance and delay. But to have it formally enunciated as a principle that he must in fact hold his crown at the will of the Pope, and humbly sue to him for the right to draw contributions from the most wealthy portion of his subjects, was too much. The king replied that if they would not give he would take;

—"Mansit in domo cujusdam simplicis Rectoris cum solo sacerdote et uno clerico, non habens ex toto archiepiscopatu ubi caput reconderet. —*Chron.*, ii. 118. As to the bishop of Lincoln, his friends contrived that the sheriff should seize a fifth part of his goods, and so he was allowed to re-enter on his possessions.

that he would not apply to the Pope, or suffer them to do so; and that they would excommunicate the officers who had been employed in the sequestrations at their peril.[1] In spite of this last prohibition the archbishop renewed the denunciations of all those who had invaded the property of the Church, and ordered the same to be published in all cathedral churches. Matters promised to be as embittered as ever, when a salutary relief came from the chief author of the mischief, the Pope, who by his arrogant commands had thus embroiled the heads of Church and State in England.

18. "Although," wrote the Pope to the King of France, "we put forth a constitution for ecclesiastical liberty, yet it was not our intention to forbid all subventions to the king himself or to other secular princes so absolutely that no aid should be given when foreign invasion is feared, or internal rebellion breaks out, or some evident danger threatens prelates, churches, and ecclesiastical persons. But the prelates of the Church and ecclesiastical persons of their own free will may by our allowance, for the common purpose of defence, in which each one is interested, aid and assist princes and themselves as their means permit."[2] Coincidently with this relaxation of the Bull becoming known, news was brought of an invasion of the Scots, who were said to have perpetrated horrible cruelties on the English in the north. An opportunity was thus given to the archbishop and the Convocation to quit the unjustifiable position they had taken up, without loss of dignity. If they taxed themselves voluntarily before the king applied for aid, no principle would be violated. Accordingly, the Southern Convocation, which met on the 20th November (1297), gave the king a tenth for the war against the Scots, while the Northern Convocation gave a fifth.[3] At the same time a declaration was published that this composition did not touch free gifts and voluntary offerings, nor fees which were held under tenure of service, and that, in case of necessity, the king could ask and receive help from

[1] *Ann. de Wigornid, Ann. Monast.*, iv. 532-3; Barthol. de Cotton, p. 335. [2] *Ann. de Wigornid, Ann. Monast.*, iv. 531.

[3] Rishanger, p. 182.

ecclesiastical persons without consulting the Roman pontiff.[1] Before this concession was made by the clergy the prince and the Council had undertaken in the king's absence that he should formally renounce any right to seize arbitrarily the property of his subjects whether lay or clerical;[2] and Edward, on his return from France, confirmed this undertaking, and published a general confirmation of the charters and a general pardon to those who had opposed him.[3]

19. Things were now therefore left in this position. The king renounced the right of taxing the clergy without their consent. The clergy on their part declared that they might give aid to the King when the necessity was apparent, even without the permission of the Pope. It was evident, however, that should the Pope please to intervene, the same difficulty might arise again. It will be observed that this struggle of Edward with his clergy differed essentially from the various contests between king and clergy as to subsidies in the reign of Henry III. At that time the interests of the King and the Pope were united; they are now separated and opposed. Under Henry III. the King was ready to tolerate any papal exactions, so long as the Pope would help him in his own exactions. Now the Pope had taken up the position of forbidding, or at least checking, the contributions of the clergy for State purposes, and from this most important results followed, for as the clergy were ready to yield to this prohibition, it became the policy and indeed the necessity of the English kings to check as much as possible the power of the popes over the English clergy. Hence the Statutes of Provisors and Præmunire, and the other anti-papal legislation, which gradually culminated in a complete emancipation of the English Church. In the struggle neither party had been free from blame. The king had been arbitrary and tyrannical. The clergy had been disloyal and unnational. But the situation was now rendered much clearer, and the foundation was laid for a wholesome advance in the future.

[1] *Ann. de Wigorniâ, Ann. Monast.*, iv. 535; Barthol. de Cotton, p. 339.

[2] Rishanger, p. 181. This is known as the Satute *De tallagio non concedendo.* For the different versions of it, see Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, ii. 142.

[3] Barthol. de Cotton, p 337.

20. The proceedings which took place with regard to Edward's claim to a right of dominion over Scotland, had the effect of producing a serious breach between the King and the Primate. The Pope had thought fit to adopt Scotland as a fief of the Papal See, and to forbid the King of England to meddle with it, and the archbishop very unwisely upheld this view. At a Parliament held at Lincoln, 1301, the whole matter was fully discussed, and a long historical statement was drawn up by the barons for submission to the Pope. The most important part of this is the last paragraph, which declares—"Our Lord the King shall by no means answer before you [the Pope] as a judge concerning his temporal rights, nor in any way submit himself to your judgment, or admit question of his rights; nor shall he send proctors to appear before you, seeing that the concession of the premisses would be the disherison of the Crown of England, and an evident subversion of the kingdom, and would be to the prejudice of the liberty, customs, and laws of our ancestors, to the observance of which we are bound by oath, and which we will maintain with our whole power and strength by the help of God. Nor will we ever allow (inasmuch as we neither can nor ought) that in the premisses, being unaccustomed, unfitting, prejudicial, and unheard-of, our Lord the King should do or attempt to do as you desire, even if he himself wished it. Wherefore we beseech your Holiness that you would allow our Lord the King to possess his liberties, rights, customs, and laws aforesaid without diminution or annoyance."[1]

21. The archbishop refused to join in this spirited protest, and induced the other prelates to act with him; in fact, he was a partisan of the Pope in the matter, and hence arose anew the quarrels about the taxation, and a feeling of intense bitterness on the part of the King against the Primate. It was probably in great measure owing to this that Winchelsea suffered himself to be led into those treasonable proposals for dethroning Edward I. and substituting his son in his stead,[2] which afterwards brought upon him such trouble and humiliation. The matter is

[1] Rishanger, *Chron.*, 209; Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, i. 96.
[2] Thorn., *X. Script. Col.*, 2004.

principally important, as regards Church history, from the fact that Edward fearing difficulties, and not clearly seeing how to act, inconsiderately referred the affair to the Pope, and procured the archbishop's trial, or pretended trial, before Clement V. It might be assumed with certainty that though the Pope, from his difficult position, might be obliged to temporise, yet that one who had incurred the King's displeasure for his too great devotion to the Papal cause would not be hardly dealt with.[1] Winchelsea's worst punishment was to remain abroad during the King's life, and, as he was thoroughly hated by his clergy, this did not amount to much. The King, having a complaisant Pope to deal with, unfortunately, not only sent his impracticable Primate to him, but allowed himself to seek a dispensation from the promises which he had made as to renewing the charters. There were some privileges assailed by the Charta de Forestâ which he could not bring himself to give up, and rather than lose them he stained a reign in many ways glorious and remarkable by this act of tergiversation and duplicity. What was even worse as regards the interests of the English Church, the King, by thus making use of the Pope for his private ends, practically undid in his old age much of that which had been his life's work to do, and the nationality of the English Church, and its due position as regards the State, were greatly impaired by his action. The Pope and the King are again found, as in the days of Henry III., mutually helping themselves from the revenues of the English clergy. The Pope grants a tenth to the King, and the King allows the Pope to appropriate the first-fruits of all English benefices for three years.[2]

22. The king had been led into this truckling to the Pope by the desire of obtaining his censure of the archbishop, and his absolution of himself from inconvenient obligations. But the barons who had so stoutly opposed papal assumptions at the Parliament of Lincoln did not so readily change their views. To their bold and honest resistance to ultramontane claims is due that which is known

[1] For his treatment, see Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops*, iii. 436.

[2] Rishanger, *Chron.*, p. 228.

as the Statute of Carlisle, the first direct anti-Roman act passed by an English Parliament.[1] This Statute (35 Edw. I., st. 1 c. 2) recites the abuses of papal patronage exercised in the form of provisions, the promotion of aliens, the seizure of deaneries of cathedral churches for foreigners, the diversion of the monastic revenues to alien purposes, the exactions practised under the name of Peter's Pence, contributions for crusades and fines, and specially the exactions of William de Testâ, the Pope's agent, and his commissaries illegally appointed, and enacts that the said William de Testâ shall not be allowed to carry out of the country the moneys which he has illegally exacted ; and that all those who have assisted him shall be arrested and brought before the King's courts for trial, and that messengers shall be despatched to the Pope to inform him of the above illegal proceedings, and what has been done by the Parliament in the matter.[2] Thus, however the king might vacillate, the public opinion of the influential laity was already formed and strongly expressed on these abuses ; and though no further legislation immediately followed, a beginning was thus made of a wholesome restraint of papal aggressions.

23. The death of Edward I. (July 7, 1307) and the succession of his son, who had none of the great qualities of his father, brought about the speedy return of the archbishop, the disgrace and punishment of Edward I.'s clerical adviser, Walter Langton,[3] and the advance of the papal influence. There is scarce any period in English history in which the person of the ruler is more despicable, the chief persons in the State more corrupt, and the state of society more wretched, than the reign of Edward II. ; hardly was England in a worse condition during the an-

[1] It is said by the chronicler Hemingburgh, that while the Parliament was debating on the papal exactions, there came, as "it were sent from heaven," a letter written by Peter, son of Cassiodorus, which most eloquently denounces the papal oppressions. This letter, which is given by Hemingburgh, was read in the Parliament in the hearing of the barons, the king, and the cardinal.

[2] W. de Hemingburgh, *Chron.*, ii. 259, *sq.*

[3] I. de Trokelowe, *Annales*, p. 63.

archy of the reign of Stephen, or the profligate oppressions of the latter days of John. Archbishop Winchelsea's return was marked by a judicial process against the Templars, ending in the suppression of the order,[1] which was characterised by the grossest injustice, though its cruelty did not equal the contemporary proceedings in France. At such seasons of lawlessness and relaxation of the moral fibre of the land, the watchful and astute papal power generally finds its opportunity. The time of the great Popes was now passed; the Church had entered on the Babylonish captivity of Avignon. The Council of Vienne (1311) had pronounced against Pope Boniface's famous bulls, the Pope was a French archbishop, and the strong will and unscrupulous policy of the King of France had triumphed. What the Pope had lost in power must be replaced by underhand influence and intrigue; and Clement V. now turned his attention specially to the question of patronage, by which so much might be done to uphold his influence both with the clergy and the rulers of the State. The right of election to bishoprics had always been in a confused and unsatisfactory state.[2] The popes, by the device of the pall, had practically obtained control over the appointments to the two primacies. The right of free election to the suffragan Sees had been wrung from John, but this "freedom of election had resulted in a freedom of litigation, and little more."[3] Appeals were constantly being carried to Rome, and thus the appointments were thrown into the hands of the Pope. The King could usually procure the election by the chapter of his nominee; but he had further to ensure his acceptance at Rome, although the right of confirming the suffragan bishops of their provinces had never been abandoned by the English Metropolitans. Thus the Pope had long had practically the control over the appointments to English Sees; but from the beginning of the fourteenth century his interference takes a new form, and he "assumes the patronage as well as the appellate jurisdiction."[4] This patronage takes the form of what was called *reservation.*

[1] For the full account of this, see Notes and Illustrations to this Chapter.

[2] See Appendix A.

[3] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii. 307.

[4] *Ib.*, iii. 310.

Upon the death of a prelate occurring, those to whom it would properly fall to supply a successor are informed that the Pope had, during the lifetime of the person just deceased, in his mind provided him with a successor, and had reserved the place for him; thus the higher dignities of the Church were now given away, as lesser benefices had been before, during the lifetime of the incumbents.

24. At the death of Archbishop Winchelsea, in 1313, the Canterbury monks, having obtained the royal license, elected unanimously as archbishop Master Thomas Cobham, "a man of eminent learning, and adorned with many virtues." They were, however, immediately informed by the Pope that their election would be null, for that he had, during the lifetime of Archbishop Robert, specially reserved the place for his own disposal. Cobham meanwhile proceeded to Avignon, hoping to obtain the Pope's confirmation. Pope Clement could allege nothing against the elect. He was a man distinguished for his learning and probity; nevertheless the Pope had the audacity to declare the election null, on the ground that he had "reserved" the place for his own disposal. He would, he said, "provide" in the best way for the widowed Church. How to do this with the most profit to himself now engaged his consideration; and at length his choice fell upon Walter Reynolds, bishop of Worcester, the king's chancellor; "for he acutely considered," says one chronicler, "how great favour the chancellor enjoyed with the king, and how skilfully he had managed matters between the king and his nobles, and he hoped that such a man might be of great help to the Church and the kingdom, inasmuch as he knew well how to walk in such dangerous times."[1] Walter Reynolds thus obtained the pall, his real antecedents being that he had acted as a lax and unscrupulous tutor to the profligate young prince; and his true recommendation to the Pope, that one who had shown so little principle in his previous charge[2] would probably display no more in his higher promotion, but allow papal usurpation to go on unchecked.

25. Having made this bold and unscrupulous use of the

[1] I. de Trokelowe, *Annal.*, pp. 81-2.

[2] See Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops*, iii. 459.

device of reservations and provisions, without let or hindrance, the Pope proceeded to make a further extension of this convenient privilege. Not only did he use it himself, but he made a grant to his favourites of the power of using it for their own advantage; thus we have his bulls directed to the new Primate Walter, empowering him to reserve and provide prebends in any cathedral or collegiate church, and to appoint occupants to them, notwithstanding that such presentees were canonically incompetent to hold the place, or that they held prebends in one, two, or three other churches. This unjust privilege Archbishop Reynolds was not slow to use, as his register remains to testify.[1] Further, the Pope concedes to the Primate the power of dispensing with the tax of bastardy for admission to holy orders, and the power of dispensing with the required age,[2] and gives to him other uncanonical privileges, contained in eight bulls, for which, no doubt, the archbishop had to pay heavily.[3] When two such unscrupulous men as the Pope and the Primate held the mastery over the Church of England, and the King "cared for none of these things," the worst results might confidently be anticipated to the Church.[4] Accordingly, we find that the Church sank into a lamentably low condition during this disastrous reign.

26. The most important point to be noted in its history is the attempt, to a certain extent successful, to define the limits between the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions which was made by the Statute called *Articuli Cleri* (9 Edward II., st. i. cc. 1-16). A dispute had arisen about patronage, and

[1] See Wilkins, *Concil.*, ii. 440. [2] *Ib.*, ii. 434.

[3] Dr. Hook very strangely speaks of Reynolds being actuated by "public spirit" in obtaining these bulls! (iii. 471).

[4] Clement died in 1314; but his successor followed exactly in his steps. In 1317 he *reserved* the appointments to Worcester, Hereford, Durham, and Rochester; in 1320, to Lincoln and Winchester; in 1322, to Lichfield; in 1323, to Winchester; in 1325, to Carlisle and Norwich; in 1327, to Worcester, Exeter, and Hereford; in 1329, to Bath; in 1333, to Durham; in 1334, to Canterbury, Winchester, and Worcester. —Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, ii. 312. The bulls are all printed in the *Fœdera*, vol. iii. They contained an assignation not only of the spiritualties, but of the temporalties also; but the bishop was usually made to renounce the latter donation before he received his temporalties.

the question had been brought forward whether the lay court had the right to call the spiritual officer to account for refusing to institute. The effect of the Statute was to enact that it belonged to the spiritual judge to determine as to the ability of a parson presented to a benefice, even when the patron was the Crown. A general adjudication as to what cases fell within civil and what within spiritual jurisdiction is also to be found in it.[1] Many of the cases decided refer to the right of sanctuary, and its infringement by the lay authority. The Statute is drawn up in the form of a series of complaints on the part of the clergy, to each of which the king's answer is appended seriatim. The general effect of it was considerably to confirm and clear clerical immunities.[2]

27. But in the times of Edward II. it was one thing to make laws, and quite another to pay any deference to them when the interests of the king or his favourites was involved. For, in fact, soon after the passing of this Statute, it was shown that the privileges conceded to the clergy availed them but little when the king was set to overthrow them. In the Parliament of 1324 Adam Orlton, bishop of Hereford, who had taken part in some of the struggles carried on by the barons against the king and his favourites, was impeached of high treason. The bishop answered that he had no intention of defending himself in that place, that he could only answer before the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was his proper judge, under the Pope, and that by the consent of the other bishops. Upon this all the prelates present in Parliament desired the king's grace for the accused. The bishop was given into the custody of the Archbishop until the matter should be decided. But the king ordered him to be seized and brought before a temporal court. Then the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Dublin, attended by ten other

[1] A great argument arose as to the construction of this Statute, and the laws which regulated the temporal and spiritual jurisdictions in the time of James I. Archbishop Bancroft pleaded one side, and the whole of the judges replied. See the argument printed from Sir E. Coke's *Institutes*, p. 2, in Collier, iii. 12, *sq.*

[2] See the Statute in Collier, iii. 42, *sq.*

bishops, and with their crosses erect, went in state to the court where Bishop Orlton was being tried, and carried him off in triumph, threatening excommunication to any who should lay hands on him. The king, not appalled by this display of clerical force, ordered a jury to be empannelled to try the case. The jurors brought in the bishop guilty on all the points charged against him. The bishop's goods were accordingly seized and his estates sequestrated, he himself remaining in the custody of the Archbishop of Canterbury.[1] Another bishop—Henry Burghersh, bishop of Lincoln—had been implicated in the same movement as Orlton, but he was merely kept out of his temporalties for two years, and then allowed to enter upon them.

28. The prelates of that day were, in fact, little else than intriguers and schemers, and exhibited but very slight traces of the true episcopal character. A satirist of the time thus described them:—

> Nostri Cornuti sunt consilio quasi muti,
> Sunt quasi confusi, decreto legis abusi,
> Et quia non tuti nequeunt sermonibus uti,
> Sic perit ecclesia, juris et ipsa via.[2]

On whichever side they were found—whether that of the king and his favourites, or the queen and her paramour—they seem to have been equally forgetful of their Christian duties; and if the terrible charge made against Bishop Orlton be true, he must be marked with an exceptional brand of infamy.[3] As to the Primate, he was at best but a weak and vacillating guide, and was contented at last to desert his former pupil who had heaped honours upon him, and to cast in his lot with the party of the young prince. The most respectable prelate of the day was Walter Staple-

[1] Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, i. 171-2. Collier remarks from Parker that this was the first case in England of a bishop being tried in a temporal court (iii. 50). Orlton was attached to the queen and the Mortimers, and is generally supposed to have been the suggester of the king's murder. Walsingham says of him that he was *literis abundanter imbutus* (i. 173).

[2] Walsingham, i. 173.

[3] The Apologia Adæ Orlton, who was afterwards transferred to Winchester, is printed in Twysden. *Script. X.*, p. 2765. The strongest case against him will be found in Thomas de la Moor, pp. 600-2.

ton, bishop of Exeter, the founder of Exeter College, Oxford, who, though occupied like his brethren in secular affairs, was faithful to the king, but so hateful to the citizens of London that he met his death in a popular tumult in Cheapside.[1] Bishops Stratford and Ayermin obtained their Sees by gross treachery. Having been sent by the King to the Pope to obtain his acceptance of another man (Richard de Baldock), they substituted themselves for the king's nominee, and, no doubt by a free use of bribes, gained their end. The bishops had indeed become hateful to the people. The Church was completely in abeyance as to any influence for good; and when at length, by the deposition of the king and the substitution of the young prince, things had taken a new form, the hopes of good men probably somewhat revived, inasmuch as any change seemed to give possibilities of improvement.

29. A certain measure of relief came to the Church from the appointment of a new Primate. Archbishop Reynolds died in 1327, it is said chiefly from grief and mortification at his own misconduct in the matter of the deposition of the king, and Simon Mepham, canon of Chichester, was chosen to succeed him. Why Simon, a man but little known and of no great force of character, was selected for this high post seems doubtful. It is supposed by some that he was the queen's confessor, and hence obtained[2] her powerful influence with the court of Avignon in procuring the Pope's confirmation. After considerable trouble and delay this was obtained, and Simon was consecrated abroad. He was a simple straightforward man, and he had the especial merit of having no political aims, and no desire to figure as a statesman. He gave all his energy, such as it was, to the reformation of the Church. There was a general wish at this time to substitute laymen in place of clergy in offices of State, and a general sense of shame at the degradation to which the episcopal office had been subjected by being held by scheming politicians. The age, however, was not yet ripe for the abolition of clerical office-holders. There were not to be found among the lay-

[1] Walsingham, i. 182.

[2] See the letters of king, queen, and nobles.—Wilkins, ii. 540.

men a sufficient number of persons competent to manage State affairs, and the clerical body had still for a long period to be largely employed in these capacities. Every protest, however, against this secular degradation, and every indication of its being good to aim at a higher standard, was valuable, and of such a character was the short episcopate of Simon Mepham. Immediately after his enthronisation the archbishop summoned his provincial synod (February 1328), and the Constitutions which he then published are important.[1] The document begins with solemn words. "It concerns prelates of the Church to have a zeal for the Lord their God (for failing this they will be damned not only with a personal perdition, but the Lord will require at their hands the blood of their subjects), especially against those who are honoured with the name of Christians, and yet contradict their profession by their damned works; so as to root out by the sword of the Spirit and the hoe of ecclesiastical discipline all hurtful vices, and graft virtue, and reform manners, so that evil appetites may not exceed the bounds of honesty, but that the Christian profession may be advanced with a salutary increase."[2] After this preamble, which is a severe comment upon the irreligion of the day, the archbishop decrees (first) the solemn observation of Good Friday "in reading with silence, in prayer with fasting, in compunction with tears," and forbids "that any attend their servile works on that day, or be employed in any business inconsistent with piety. Yet we do not hereby lay any law upon the poor, nor forbid the rich to yield their customary assistance to the poor in tilling their lands for charity's sake."[3] The second Constitution orders the observance of the Festival of the Conception of the Virgin, "following the steps of our venerable predecessor Anselm, who, after other more ancient solemnities of hers,

[1] Archbishops Winchelsea and Reynolds also published Constitutions. These are not very important, but some curious indications of the nature of church furniture, fittings, etc., contained in them will be found in Notes and Illustrations.

[2] Johnson, *Eng. Canons*, ii. 345.

[3] *Ib.* This was the first express order for the observance of Good Friday.

thought fit to add that of her Conception."[1] The third Constitution decrees the penalty of excommunication against those who seize the goods of the clergy, and provides for the citation of such offenders into the court Christian. The fourth decrees a like penalty against those who hindered or opposed the executions of the wills of villeins, in order thereby to obtain possession of their goods as lords. The fifth ordains that nothing be charged to a poor man's estate for the legal publication of his will. The eighth ordains, under severe penalties, the publication of banns before marriage. The ninth regulates the payments for dilapidations, which are to be assessed "by credible persons sworn in form of law."[2] These Constitutions are practical and valuable, and singularly coincide with modern legal requirements. The archbishop also applied his attention to restraining the number of festivals on which no work might be done, specifying as chief festivals Sundays, the Nativity, Circumcision, Epiphany, and Ascension of our Lord; the days of the Apostles and Evangelists; the Conception, Nativity, Annunciation, Purification, and Assumption of the Blessed Virgin; St. Thomas the Martyr, and the Translation of St. Thomas; the Invention and Exaltation of the Cross, St. Lawrence, St. Michael, and St. Nicholas; and declaring that "on other feasts of saints people may with impunity proceed to their work."[3] But the principal work done by the archbishop was done in detail, in the metropolitical visitation which he commenced in 1329, and carried on with much vigour. At Rochester he inflicted a severe censure on the bishop. He visited also the dioceses of Chichester, Salisbury, Bath and Wells, apparently without opposition. But when he came to the diocese of Exeter the case was different. Here he found a bishop who was strong in high birth and great wealth, and who was, probably, fully conscious that his administration of his diocese would not bear a close scrutiny. He determined, therefore, to resist the Primate's entrance with a high hand. When the Primate reached Exeter, he found a body of armed

[1] Anselm probably first introduced this festival into England. Its observation had been decreed many centuries before.

[2] Johnson, *Eng. Can.*, ii. 345-354. [3] Wilkins, ii. 560.

men drawn up to oppose his further advance. Unless a battle were actually to be fought, the archbishop must needs retire, and this he elected to do. The Primate stirred the waters of the clerical sea, but he can hardly be said to have done more. His latter years were troubled by a dispute with the monks of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, and he was actually excommunicated by the Pope's commissary for refusing to pay the fine inflicted on him. This fulmination, however, he had the good sense to disregard.[1]

30. On the death of Archbishop Mepham (1333) the primacy was obtained by John Stratford, an able political prelate of the type of Roger of Salisbury and Hubert Walter, and far more of a secular minister than a prelate. He had been bishop of Winchester, and the Pope readily accepted his promotion that he might obtain the disposal of the rich See of Winchester. This he bestowed on the notorious Adam Orlton, who, with Bishop Burghersh of Lincoln, was at the head of the party which was in opposition to that of Archbishop Stratford and his brother the bishop of Chichester. These two brothers had both held the Great Seal, and the Primate soon became, "as archbishop, treasurer, and president of the Royal Council, supreme in the treasury as well as in the chancery."[2] It was the period of the French war waged by Edward III. with such remarkable vigour. The king was sorely pressed for funds. The archbishop, although he had encouraged the king to undertake the war, refused to provide the funds. Hence a violent quarrel arose between him and the king. The archbishop complained of oppressions and exactions used towards the clergy, of illegal imprisonments and outrages, against the authors of which he published his excommunications. The king asserted that Stratford was guilty of gross deception, falsehood, and treason. The quarrel led to the impeachment of the Primate, the imprisonment of his two brothers the bishops of Chichester and Coventry. The king endeavoured to enlist the clergy on his side as against the archbishop by the publication of a pamphlet or *libellus*, in which he violently accused him for his defaults

[1] See the whole account given at great length in W. Thorn, printed in *X. Scriptores* (Twysden). [2] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, ii. 385.

in the matter of providing the supplies. The archbishop replied in detail to the King's charges. The Parliament, which felt the pressure of the demands for the war, was with the Primate, and the King was ultimately obliged, not only to receive Stratford back into favour, but to make considerable concessions to the different estates.[1] These concessions were soon afterwards treacherously revoked by Edward, who, though a great commander, was a bad governor of his people, and whose word was not to be relied on.

31. Nevertheless the spirited character of Edward and his resentment at foreign interference were not without considerable value to the English Church. The clergy were in danger of becoming more and more papalised as the patronage of the Church was got more and more completely into the hands of the Pope, and were even disposed to ignore the king altogether. Against this the king was determined to act with spirit and energy. Anthony Beck, bishop of Norwich, had been elected without the king's license for the chapter to proceed to an election, and had proceeded to Rome without seeking the king's confirmation. Upon this Edward addressed a letter of remonstrance to Pope Benedict XI. He declares that the chapters had received the liberty of choosing their bishop, under the understanding that they should seek from the king the license for so doing, and, after the election, present the person chosen to the king for acceptance. That the king was to grant the bishop the temporalties on the oath of allegiance being taken. This arrangement had been accepted and confirmed by popes, but had been disregarded in the case of Anthony Beck, who, having been elected, had gone straightway to Rome without seeking the royal confirmation. The Pope is desired not to countenance such infringements of the law.[2]

32. That no effectual notice was taken of the king's just complaint, did not tend to make him better inclined to tolerate papal encroachments. In 1343, Clement VI. made

[1] See, for the letters, Hemingburgh, *Chron.*, ii. 363, *sq.*; Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.*, i. 231, *sq.*; Birchington in *Anglia Sacra*, vol. i.; Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 661, *sq.*; Rymer, ii. 1143, *sq.* [2] *Ang. Sacra*, i. 414.

a *provision* for two cardinals on the English Church to the amount of 2000 marks per annum. This outrage was resented by the King and Parliament. The barons in Parliament assembled addressed a petition to the king that he would take steps to rectify this great and crying abuse. The king readily listened to their request, and undertook to act in the matter. On the 18th May the barons themselves addressed a remonstrance to the Pope, stating respectfully but firmly the causes of their complaint. They say that they and their ancestors had founded churches to make provision for Christian devotion and instruction, for the practice of charity and hospitality, but that all these good purposes were frustrated by the Pope's seizure of their benefices for foreigners, who were absentees and ignorant of the language and habits of the people. The Pope is requested to remedy this abuse, and he is given to understand that the barons had no intention of desisting from energetic action to obtain a redress of their grievances.[1] The king then directs a letter to those concerned in the matter, forbidding the papal officers to act in presenting to these *provided* benefices, forbidding the presentees or their representatives to enter upon them, and charging all his subjects in no case to obey or assist such presentees or their agents. Another letter was also addressed to the sheriffs, bidding them make public proclamation that no one, of whatever degree, should venture, under pain of heavy penalties, to bring within the realm of England letters, bulls, processes, or any kind of instrument prejudicial to the authority of the Crown, addressed to the archbishops and bishops; and that no one should venture to receive the same, but that all those engaged in so doing should be straightway imprisoned.[2] This energetic action soon produced a complaint from the Pope. He declared that he had quartered the two cardinals upon the English Church with a view to the benefit of that Church and realm, but that their agents and proctors, coming to take possession of the benefices assigned to them, had been hindered by the king's officers, treated with ignominy, thrown into prison, and afterwards expelled the country. For all these injuries the Pope

[1] Hemingburgh, *Chron.*, ii. 401. [2] *Ib.*, ii. 410.

desired redress.[1] In reply to this letter the King addressed to the Pope what is called in Walsingham "that famous letter in defence of the liberties of the English Church." He complains that the Church was suffering grievously under the system of provisions and reservations; that the encouragements of religion were misspent upon unworthy persons—men that neither understood the language of the country, nor resided on their benefices, and who were destitute both of the disposition and the ability to discharge their office; that by these mercenary followers the value of the priesthood was lost, and the benefit of religion forfeited, the native clergy, persons of great learning and probity, were discouraged, patrons lost their rights, the treasure of the country was carried off by strangers. The mischief had become intolerable, and the Parliament had desired that a remedy should be provided for it. The Pope should remember that he was the successor of St. Peter, not for the purpose of shearing the sheep, but to feed them. The Apostles took care to appoint fit persons to the ministry, so ought their successors to do. The kings of England had been well disposed to the papacy, and deserved a fitting return. They had agreed, and the See of Rome had consented, that the choice of prelate should be with the chapters. But all arrangements were put aside by these provisions and reservations, and other devices of the Apostolic See.[2]

33. Matters were thus tending rapidly towards the making of some effectual provision to check this abuse which had so long vexed the English Church. In the Parliament of the next year (1344), the clergy having voted a tenth to the King, another statute of the same character as the *Circumspectè agatis* and the *Articuli Cleri* was passed (18 Edward III, st. iii. cc. 6, 7). This provided that no prelate should be tried before a secular tribunal without the king's special order. The case of bigamy was reserved for the spiritual court. The law of Mortmain was somewhat relaxed. Prohibitions were

[1] Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, i. 259. This letter is not given in Hemingburgh.

[2] Hemingburgh, *Chron.*, ii. 403; Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, i. 255.

checked and regulated. The effect of the statute was to increase and strengthen clerical privileges and immunities, so that it might clearly be seen that the King and Parliament, in resisting papal aggressions, were not animated by any spirit of hostility to the clergy, but were honestly desirous to defend the National Church from foreign encroachment.

34. It was indeed marvellous that an abuse so flagrant, so palpable to all, so utterly indefensible, as the using of English benefices to pay the Pope's creatures, should have been allowed to continue so long; that the same grievance which had vexed and overcome good Archbishop Edmund Rich a hundred years before, should still be vexing English prelates; and that the barons and kings of England, who had so often complained of this, should yet have supplied no remedy. The real hindrance had been the unholy compact so often entered into between Pope and King, that each should tolerate the injustice of the other, on condition that each should be allowed to spoil at will the undefended clergy. But now political circumstances made the interests of the Pope and King to be at variance. The Pope at Avignon was more a French prelate than the Father of Christendom. It was not agreeable to the English aspirant to the throne of France that the goods of England should be given to one who was under the control of his rival. Circumstances, therefore, were favourable for the obtaining some real checks to papal abuses. As regards the sentiments of the clergy themselves, though the growth of papal devotion had been greatly developed in them in the days of Boniface VIII. and Archbishop Winchelsea, yet, since the transference of the Papal See to Avignon, this had been much diminished, and indeed they themselves were some of the chief sufferers in the matter of provisions. It is true that the higher clergy were led to look to the Pope as the source of patronage and promotion, but their own action as patrons was grievously interfered with, and in especial the monasteries had to suffer heavy oppressions. The terrible plague of 1349, which destroyed at least one-third of the population of England, and paralysed many industries, rendered it more than ever necessary to protect every resource of the country

from foreign rapacity. When, therefore, the Parliament met in 1351, it might be augured beforehand that some strong measures would be passed to check the use so long made by the Pope of the revenues of English Sees.

35. The spirited proceedings of the year 1343 in this matter, detailed above, had been to a certain extent confirmed in 1344, when a petition of the Commons for the perpetual affirmation of the king's action received the assent of the king and barons. Three years later, however, the law was still unexecuted. But in the Parliament of 1351, the king's ordinance was carefully amended and passed as a statute—known as the first great Statute of Provisors (25 Edw. III., st. 4). This law recited the Statute of Carlisle (1307), which forbade the sending out of the country incomes of monasteries which had been founded in England; ordained that the elections to elective dignities and benefices should be free, and that the patrons should have their rights; complained that the Pope gave English benefices to aliens, just as if he were patron; and enacted that in case the Pope collated to any archbishopric, bishopric, dignity, or other benefice, in disturbance of free elections or presentations, the patronage of such benefice was to be forfeited to the Crown, and the King was to dispose of the benefice for one turn. And if any person should procure reservations or provisions from the Pope in disturbance of free elections, or of the presentees of the king or other patrons, that then the said provisors, their procuratories and notaries, were to be arrested, and being convicted, to be imprisoned till they had satisfied the fine imposed on them to the king and the party aggrieved. They were also to find security that they would not attempt such things in the time to come, and that they would not sue any man in the court of Rome for the process taken against them.[1]

[1] The assent of the Lords spiritual was not given to this statute, and it was systematically evaded. But it nevertheless furnished a wholesome check on the evil practice, and being followed up by legislation in 1352, 1365, and 1390, and enforced by the Parliaments of Henry IV. and Henry V., it in some measure brought about a cessation of it.

36. Such was the first serious attempt to protect by statute the nationality of the Church of England. An abuse indeed, which so many were interested in upholding, and which had been so long tolerated, as that of provisions, was not likely to be overthrown by a simple enactment. But the struggle was thus commenced, and the line of resistance indicated, only to completely reach its goal in the sixteenth century. The immediate effect of the statute was to make the king's nominations to sees, which in earlier times had practically been the appointments to them, but the force of which had been interfered with by the Pope's action, receive again their original weight. The practice now regularly began for the King to send to the chapter with the Congé d'eslire, a letter missive signifying the person whom he would accept. Thus the right of the chapter to elect freely, recognised in theory, was practically superseded.[1] A letter requesting the Pope's provision or acceptance of the person nominated and elected was also written, and the Pope was still allowed to retain the provision to Sees vacated by translation. In the following year it was thought necessary to support the provisors statute by an ordinance which declared all those who purchased provisions to be outlaws, and in the year which succeeded (1353) another most important Act to restrain papal influence and power in the country was passed.

37. This is usually known as the Statute of *Præmunire*, from the first word in the writ addressed to the Sheriff contained in the Act, and divers other Acts of the same tenor which followed, are always described by the same name. The preamble recites "that grievous complaints had been made by the great men and commons that divers of the people were drawn out of the realm to answer of things whereof the cognisance pertains to the king's court; and also that the judgments given in the same court were impeached in another court to the prejudice of the king and destruction of the common law; it enacts therefore that

[1] This was in reality the only reliable barrier against the Pope's action, as through the subserviency of the clergy and their weak fear of excommunication, the Pope could always act through them. The royal supremacy is the true defence of the English Church.

any of the king's lieges who should lodge a plea against any in courts not within the realm, or on matters whereon the king's courts give judgment, should have two months' warning given to them to appear in the king's courts to answer their contempt; and if they do not appear at the proper time, then they, their proctors and attorneys, shall be straightway put out of the king's protection, their lands, goods, and chattels forfeited to the king, their persons imprisoned during the king's pleasure."[1] Thus the rights of patrons and the independence of the English courts were fortified and secured as far as statutes could do this. Much more, however, was wanted before the National Church could take its proper independent position towards that great centre of disturbance and usurpation, the court of the Roman bishop. In the next chapter a very important element in the taking up of this position will demand our notice. The National Church, having begun to assert her rights and privileges, begins now to review her doctrines, and to discover that just as the rightful legal position of churches had been overborne by Rome, so too the purity of primitive doctrine had been grievously obscured by the accretions fostered and upheld by her; and that in both respects much needed to be done to recover what had been lost.

[1] 27 Edw. III., s. 1. This Act was confirmed in 1365, and re-enacted more fully in the famous statute of 1393 (16 Ric. II. c. 5), which is often called the Statute of Præmunire (*par excellence*).

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A) THE VARIOUS FORMS OF SUMMONING THE CLERGY.

1. The first plan by which the *representation* of the clergy in Convocation was attempted to be provided was by making the archdeacons their representatives. In 1257 Archbishop Boniface issued his mandate for a Convocation, to which the archdeacons are summoned, and are ordered to bring with them "procurational letters on the part of the clergy who are under them." 2. In 1273 Archbishop Kilwardby summoned the bishops, and bade them bring with them "three or four persons from among the most discreet and prudent of their church and diocese." 3. Four years later Archbishop Kilwardby bids the bishops assemble, with "proctors for the whole clergy of each diocese." This probably meant one proctor for

each diocese. 4. In the Council of Reading (1279) it was agreed that at the next meeting there should come to the Convocation "two persons at least *elected by the clergy* in each diocese." In 1282 a synod at Northampton would not vote money for the clergy, because parish clergy were not represented. The following year Archbishop Peccham summoned the clergy to assemble. Each bishop was to hold a preliminary diocesan council, when two clergy were to be elected, who should be "sufficiently instructed and have full power to treat and agree to what was decided upon at the Convocation." Thus the present plan was reached. — Stubbs, *Select Charters*, pp. 444-446.

(B) THE CONSTITUTIONS OF ARCHBISHOP PECCHAM AT READING, 1279.

The Constitutions commence with a sort of homily against pluralities, which are said to be multiplied in spite of the regulations of Cardinal Othobon. The archbishop decrees—

That those who accept a benefice in plurality shall thereby forfeit the benefices held before, retaining *only the last.*

Those who acquire many benefices by means of commendams are declared excommunicate.

A list to be made of all benefices and their incumbents.

The directions of the Council of Lyons as to the holding of benefices to be observed.

Priests to explain to the people "on the Lord's day after every rural chapter" what is implied by and who are implicated in the general sentences of cursing ordered by the Council of Oxford to be recited in the church. [Several of the *explanations* given in the Constitutions the archbishop was obliged afterwards to revoke.]

The Constitutions of Othobon to be published in churches four times a year. Magna Charta to be hung up in churches in a conspicuous place.

Children born shortly before Pentecost or Easter to be reserved to be baptized then. Children born at other times to be baptized as they are born, or soon afterwards.

The ordinance against concubinaries to be publicly rehearsed four times a year.

The chrism, or consecrated oil for baptism and extreme unction, to be fetched every year by the priest from the bishop. The old chrism not to be reserved.

A tabernacle to be made in each church, where the consecrated wafer may be kept enclosed and secure; wafer to be renewed every Lord's day; to be carried to the sick, the priest being in surplice and stole, having a light and a bell, that the people may prostrate themselves.

Solemn service for the dead to be performed when an Archbishop of Canterbury or any bishop dies. Indulgences not to be given beyond forty days. Clerks imprisoned not to be allowed purgation on slight pretences. Religious persons not to stay in secular houses, nor to entertain seculars. Rectors not to cut down the trees in churchyards.

At the meeting of the next Parliament, "besides the persons of the bishops, and the proxies of such as may be absent, two at least, elected by the clergy of every bishopric, do come with sufficient authority to treat with us concerning such things as may be for the common interest of the Church of England, even if it becomes needful to treat of a certain contribution or expenditure." — Johnson, *English Canons*, ii. 252-270.

ARCHBISHOP PECCHAM'S CONSTITUTIONS AT LAMBETH, 1283.

Priests to instruct their parishioners that when at mass they receive

the consecrated wafer, the "whole Christ" is given to them. In small churches only those who celebrate to receive the consecrated wine. Wine may be given to the laity at the mass to assist the swallowing the wafer. Priests are not to undertake special masses so as to disable themselves from performing the office for their own churches. Not to undertake more annuals than they are able to perform in separate masses unless the friends of the dead agree that the memory of their friend may be joined with that of others. The priest must not think that by saying one mass for two he performs his undertaking to say mass entirely for two separate persons.

Children who have been baptized by laymen or women not to be rebaptized. Inasmuch as Confirmation is generally neglected, none are to be admitted to receive the Eucharist unless confirmed, except in case of necessity. Clerks not to receive five degrees of orders in one day—that is to say, four not sacred degrees and one sacred. Priests not to absolve those who are *ipso facto* excommunicated, and whom they have no power to absolve. Penance, which "seems to be buried in oblivion," to be enforced for great crimes. Penance for murder reserved to the bishop. A confessor to be appointed in each deanery to hear confessions of clergy. Every priest to expound to the people four times a year in the vulgar tongue, "without any fanatical affectation of subtlety, the fourteen articles of faith, the ten commandments of the Decalogue, the two precepts of the Gospel or of love to God and man, the seven works of mercy, the seven capital sins with their progeny, the seven principal virtues, and the seven sacraments of grace. And that ignorance be no man's excuse, though all ministers of the Church are bound to know them, we have here briefly summed them up." [Then follows a form of instruction.] Rectors, if non-resident, to direct their stewards to exercise hospitality. Rural deans not to sell certificates. Judges in ecclesiastical courts to be on their guard against false proxies and fictitious suits, whereby the interests of absent persons are often injured. Clandestine inquests into the tenure of benefices, whereby the rightful possessors are often ejected, to be forbidden. Churches not to be farmed except to ecclesiastics, and a portion of the revenues to be reserved for the poor. Canons of the order of St. Augustine to attend visitations as other canons. Those guilty of unchastity with nuns to be excommunicated. Nuns not to wander about the country, nor to stay at their friends' houses more than six days at a time. Nuns and monks who have been in noviciate for a year to be held *ipso facto* professed, religious who return to secular life, to be sent back again to their rule. Religious persons not to be executors of wills. Clerks not to dress like soldiers, but to wear clerical dress, and not to use coifs or head-laces. Benefices not to be inherited by the sons of clerks. Letters-patent to be given by the bishop to a clerk admitted to a benefice. Holders of pluralities threatened with severe punishment. None to be an advocate in Church courts who has not studied the canon law for three years. Mass to be said by all clergy for a bishop when he dies.

[A list is subjoined of the ornaments of the church, distinguishing what belong to the parson and what to the parishioners.]

[Belonging to the parishioners.]

Chalice.
Principal mass-vestment.
Chesible.
Alb.
Amyt.
Maniple.
Girdle.
2 Towels.
Processional cross.
Lesser cross for dead.

Bier.
Cense-pot.
Lantern and bell.
Lent-veil.
Manuals.
Banners.
Bells.
Vessel for holy water.
Salt and bread.
Osculatory.
Easter taper with candlestick.
Bells in steeple with ropes.
Fonts with lock and key.

[To the parishioners belong] all reparations of the body of the Church within and without, as well in altars as images, glass windows, with the enclosure of the Church.

[To the parson belong] all other particulars and ornaments, with the reparation of the chancel within and without. — Johnson, *Eng. Canons*, ii. 271-303.

(C) THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TEMPLARS IN ENGLAND.

This very unjust proceeding was due entirely to foreign influence. There was no national movement and feeling in England against the Templars. But Philip the Fair, King of France, had been excited to bitter hatred of the order, and had determined to destroy it, and the Pope, Clement V., a French prelate, was a mere puppet in his hands. To support then his own cruel proceedings against the Templars in France, Philip, using the power of the Pope, endeavoured to stir up all the powers in Europe against them. The English King had actually written letters in defence of the Templars to the Kings of Portugal, Castile, Sicily, and Arragon, and to the Pope himself, when the Pope's Bulls arrived ordering the arrest of all the Templars in England. Edward at once yielded. Orders were sent everywhere to the sheriffs, and on the Wednesday after the Epiphany (1308) the Templars were everywhere arrested. Courts were appointed for their trial at London, Lincoln, York; certain commissioners, who were all ecclesiastics, being appointed by the Pope as their judges. The trial lasted for several years, all sorts of hearsay evidence of the feeblest description being received. The whole proceedings are given at length in Wilkins's *Concilia*. Nothing was really proved against the Templars, but a certain number of the knights were, to satisfy the Pope, condemned to imprisonment in monasteries (not very rigid), and the estates of the order were forfeited to the Crown. The order of Templars was finally dissolved by the Council of Vienne (1311). The mild proceedings in England contrast very favourably with the horrible cruelties practised in France.

CHAPTER XX.

THE REVOLT AGAINST MEDIÆVAL DOCTRINE—JOHN WYCLIFFE.

1353-1384.

1. Causes which gave occasion for Wycliffe's teaching. 2. His early life and first propounding of novel doctrines. 3. He advocates the taxing of the clergy. 4. Anti-Papal feeling in the Good Parliament. 5. Impatience of clerical wealth encouraged by Wycliffe. 6. Wycliffe summoned before the Convocation. 7. Twenty-four propositions extracted from his writings sent to the Pope. 8. The Pope issues Bulls against him. 9. Wycliffe defends his positions. 10. Summoned to St. Paul's and Lambeth. 11. His position compromised by John of Gaunt's proceedings. 12. Causes which gave a new direction to Wycliffe's teaching. 13. His twelve propositions on the Eucharist. 14. Discussed and condemned at Oxford. 15. Change of feeling in the matter at Oxford; his enemies appeal. 16. Courtney determines to act against him. 17. The Convocation of May 1382; the twenty-four propositions. 18. Movement at Oxford in favour of Wycliffe. 19. The Primate and the Oxford doctors. 20. The Lollard divines silenced. 21. Wycliffe's teaching and work at Lutterworth. 22. Summoned by Pope Urban; his reply. 23. Illness and death.

1. THE great revolt from the doctrine of the mediæval Church which was witnessed in England during the latter half of the fourteenth century was doubtless due in great measure to social and political causes. The country was reduced to the lowest pitch of misery by the plague, which had carried off one-third of its inhabitants, and the French war, which had exhausted its resources. It was a prevalent opinion that the revenues of the kingdom had been ill-managed, and the odium arising from this belief attached itself to the Church, the prelates of which had, with rare exceptions, held all the great offices in the State for a long period.[1] As popular anger was directed against them, so in a still stronger degree it was directed against the Pope, who, as a French prelate, was regarded as the natural enemy

[1] See Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, ii. 413.

of the land, as well as the great spoiler of the Church. In 1365 was passed a new Statute of Præmunire, definitely aimed against the jurisdiction of the Papal Court; and in 1366 a demand rashly made by the Pope for the arrears of tribute due from the concession of King John, was brought before Parliament. A demand of such a nature, made at such a time, and by one who was clearly in the interest of the enemies of the country, was not likely to be received very favourably. It was rejected by Parliament with such vigour that a similar claim was never afterwards renewed.[1] This event is principally important in Church history as having given occasion to the first genuine public utterance of John Wycliffe, who was destined to make so great a mark upon the Church history of his day.[2]

2. Wycliffe, born about 1324 at Hipswell, in Yorkshire, was educated probably at Balliol College, of which society he became Master in 1361, and was the same year presented to the living of Fillingham, in Lincolnshire. He soon obtained leave of non-residence from his living, in order to prosecute his studies, and for some years rented rooms in Queen's College, Oxford, from which fact has probably arisen the assertion that he was educated at Queen's. He was made a royal chaplain,[3] and in 1363 he took the degree of doctor in divinity. At this time it is said by his opponents that his heretical opinions began first to show themselves.[4] He had been previously known as an acute disputant in the schools, and a strong opponent of the

[1] Stubbs, ii. 415; Shirley, *Introd. to Fascic. Zizaniorum*, xix. "Even Peter's pence, the ancient Romescot, which dated from the days of Offa and Ethelwulf, was withheld for a time" (Stubbs).

[2] "That in 1356 Wycliffe published his first work, *The Last Age of the Church;* that the same year he was one of the fellows of Merton; and that in 1360 he took up the pen of the dying Archbishop Fitzralph in his memorable controversy with the Mendicants, are facts only by courtesy and repetition."—Shirley, *Introduction to Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. xix.

[3] *Peculiaris regis clericus.* The discovery of the fact that there were two John Wycliffes resident in Oxford at the same time, one of whom was Fellow of Merton and Warden of Canterbury Hall, and the other Master of Balliol, has cleared up the obscurities of the reformer's history.

[4] *Fascic. Zizaniorum*, p. 2.

friars, who at that time were a great power in the university; but no specially heretical opinions seem to have been imputed to him until after he had taken his doctor's degree. Among the dogmas now set down to him appear the propositions that "no one in holy orders ought to exercise temporal authority;" that "no ecclesiastic ought to be a holder of property;" that "temporal lords have the power of taking away temporal goods from ecclesiastical persons;" that "no one is bound to give tithes and oblations to unworthy pastors."[1] These opinions were just such as to render Wycliffe a popular person with the anti-Church party; and it is quite in accordance with them that we find him, in 1366, coming forward to defend the right of Parliament to refuse the subsidy to the Pope.[2] He maintained the proposition, "The King can justly exercise sovereign power (dominion) in the realm of England by denying the tribute to the Roman Pontiff, and the mistaken doctrines which have been imposed upon the realm are false, and have been imposed without evidence of reason and law."[3] It was this theory of the right of the State to take the property of the Church, or, in other words, to tax Church property even without the consent of the clergy, that brought Wycliffe to the front, and created so great an audience for the doctrinal teaching which he afterwards developed. In earlier days this right had not been doubted; but since the time of Boniface VIII. and Archbishop Winchelsea it seemed to have been conceded that the clergy could not be taxed without their own consent. Now, in the face of the great poverty of the country, and the danger threatening from the renewal of the French war, the question assumed a very important character.[4] While the prelates of the Church

[1] *Fascic. Zizaniorum*, p. 2.

[2] The paper is printed in Lewis's *Life of Wycliffe*, p. 349.

[3] Lewis, p. 349.

[4] "Before the Wycliffe movement began there was a strong anti-clerical feeling, and a strong anti-clerical party in the court itself, which, jealous at once of the influence of the Church in social life, and the preponderant share of the clergy in the administration of government, was likely enough, for its own ends, to ally itself with religious discontent, whilst it steadily resisted moral or spiritual reformation."—Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, ii. 419.

were filling the chief offices of an unfortunate, if not incapable government, she was opulent in the midst of universal distress; and her religious orders, ever in the vanguard of ecclesiastical pretension, were openly aspiring to a total immunity from national taxation. It was resolved that she should bear the chief burden of the next campaign." [1]

3. The Parliament of 1371 met, with William of Wykeham, bishop of Winchester, as Chancellor, and Brantingham, bishop of Exeter, as Treasurer. A strong feeling against these clerical ministers speedily developed itself. Some of the barons ventured openly to advocate the direct spoliation of the clergy. They represented the Church as an owl dressed up in feathers contributed by all the other birds. Suddenly the hawk appears, and all the birds want their plumage back, that they may fly. The owl declines to restore them. Then the birds seize their own feathers by force. This apologue is related in a treatise of Wycliffe as having been used in Parliament. He accepts and enforces the principles put forth in it.[2] The feeling against the clergy was so strong that the king was obliged to dismiss all his clerical ministers, and a tax was imposed of so much for each parish, of which the clergy were to pay a part.[3] Convocation, the proper taxing body of the clergy, voted 50,000 marks — all benefices, even the smallest, which before had been exempt, to be subjected to the tax.[4] The principles enunciated by Wycliffe[5] made him extremely unpopular with the clergy, while they recommended him to the court, and especially to John of Gaunt, the head of the anti-clerical party.

4. The mishaps to his arms and policy following one upon another in quick succession, obliged Edward III. to

[1] Shirley, *Introd. Fasc. Ziz.*, p. xxi. [2] *Ib.*

[3] All lands were included which had passed into mortmain since the twentieth year of Edward I.—Shirley.

[4] Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, i. 312 (Rolls Ed.)

[5] He had written :—"Si contra nos bellum ingruerit oportet de clericis possessionatis temporalia tanquam nobis communia et regno recipere ; et regnum nostrum cum bonis propriis tanquam magis superfluis, prudenter defendere."—*De Dominio Civili.* Shirley, *Introd.*, p. xxi., note.

adopt a change of policy. It became necessary to conciliate the Pope. Commissioners were despatched to debate the whole question of the relations between the Papacy and the Crown of England. One of these was John Wycliffe; but Wycliffe was unable to obtain acceptance for his views—all was conceded to the Pope. The Statute of Provisors was suspended by the King's sole prerogative, and the chief English commissioner obtained a See by the Pope's nomination.[1] A strong opposition to the royal policy soon displayed itself in the country. In 1376 met what was called the Good Parliament, which condemned the unjust proceedings of the court, censured the profligate ministers, and received and entertained petitions against the Papal See, in which its iniquitous dealings with the English Church are most forcibly set forth. Of these petitions no less than thirteen were presented, one of which recites "That the tax paid to the Pope of Rome for ecclesiastical dignities doth amount to five-fold as much as the tax of all the profits that appertain to the King, by the year, of this whole realm; that the brokers of that sinful city for money promote many caitiffs, being altogether unlearned and unworthy, to a thousand marks living yearly, whereas the learned and worthy can hardly obtain twenty marks; that aliens, enemies to this land, who never saw, nor care to see, their parishioners, have those livings, whereby they despise God's service and convey away the treasure of the realm, and are worse than Jews or Saracens; that there is none so rich prince of Christendom who hath the fourth part of so much treasure as the Pope hath out of this realm for churches, most sinfully; that cardinals and other aliens remaining at the court of Rome—whereof one cardinal is a dean of York, another of Salisbury, another of Lincoln, another archdeacon of Canterbury, another archdeacon of York, another of Durham, and another of Suffolk—have divers other the best dignities in England, and have sent over yearly unto them 20,000 marks, over and above that which English brokers lying here have; that, therefore, it would be good to renew all the statutes against provisions from Rome, since the Pope reserveth all the benefices of the world for his own proper

[1] Walsingham, i. 320.

gift; that the Pope in time will give the temporal manors or dignities to the King's enemies, since he daily usurpeth on the realm and the King's regality; that all houses and corporations of religion, which from the King ought to have free elections of their heads, the Pope hath now accroached to himself;—for remedy whereof they pray that no papal collector be allowed in England upon pain of life and limb, and that no Englishman become any such collector, or remain at the court of Rome." [1]

5. The strong feeling entertained against the Pope and his exactions extended to all those who were specially concerned to uphold the system, and in particular to the friars. These mendicants had now grown into an immense army, and regularly perambulated every part of the country, which was divided into districts or *limits* for the purposes of their quest.[2] The feeling that, in the poverty of the land and the great needs for public objects, so much should be gathered for alien purposes, pervaded the people, and made them readily listen to the denunciations which Wycliffe now not sparingly used both of the Pope and his supporters. He condemned the Pope and his exactions, those who gathered alms for him, and equally he condemned the "possessioners," those religious who had great estates, as well as the prelates and their luxury. "Prelates," he writes, "comen instead of apostles, and seyn that they suen Christ and His Apostles in manner of living. They owen to be most meke of any other, and most busy in studying and

[1] Lewis's *Wycliffe*, p. 35, from Fox's *Acts and Monuments*.

[2] Chaucer thus describes the friars begging :—

"In every house he gan to pore and pine,
And beggid mele and chese or elles corne.
His felaw had a staff tippid with horne,
A pair of tables alle of ivory,
A poyntell polished full fetously;
And wrote alwey the namis as he stode
Of all the folk that yave him any gode,
Askauncis, as if he wolde for them pray.
Yeve us a bushel whete, or malt, or rey,
A Goddis kichell or a trip of cheese,
A Goddis halfpenny or a mass peny;
Or yeve us of your brawn, if he have any,
A dagon of your blanket, leve dame,
Our suster dere, lo here I write your name."

Sompnour's Tale

teching of holy Writ, and ensample of all good manner of life both to Christen men and hethen; but they ben so choked with tallow of worldly goods, and occupation abouten them, that they may not preach the gospel and warn the people of the devil's deceits. Prelates maken themselves most unable to keep the gospel of Christ by their great business abouten rotten goods, and by pomp and boast of this world; for they ben most busy of all men in the world to getten worldly goods by purchase, and to holden them by false plea."[1]

6. The denunciations which Wycliffe freely uttered against all classes of the clergy for their luxury and worldliness naturally angered them against him, and induced them to seek his ruin. On the other hand, they were extremely useful to the Duke of Lancaster, who was striving for political purposes to humble the clergy, and was especially bitter against William of Wykeham. The duke and the divine were men totally dissimilar in their characters and in the objects they had in view, but circumstances drew them together.[2] Wycliffe was summoned from Oxford[3] by a special messenger, to aid the duke in intimidating the Convocation. But the duke found that the clergy were not to be so easily intimidated. They absolutely refused to vote anything in Convocation until William of Wykeham, whose temporalties had been seized, was restored to his rights. More than this; deeply resenting the part which Wycliffe had taken in supporting the attacks of John of Gaunt, they summoned him to appear before Convocation to answer for his alleged heresies on the theory of government and the relations of Church and State.[4] His teaching on these points, says Dr. Shirley, "may easily have appeared subversive of the framework

[1] Lewis, p. 39.

[2] "Wycliffe, led away perhaps by his own sanguine spirit, and looking on Lancaster as the Puritans of Elizabeth's time looked upon Leicester, perhaps as Luther looked on Philip of Hesse, too readily allowed himself to be used by the unscrupulous politician."—Stubbs.

[3] Wycliffe had exchanged the living of Fillingham for Luggershall near Oxford, and had vacated that by being appointed parson of Lutterworth in Leicestershire about 1375, but he probably spent a good deal of his time at Oxford lecturing, etc.

[4] His books, *De Dominio Civili* and *De Dominio Divino* had been

of society." [1] He connected the rights of property with the moral and religious condition of the holder in an altogether perilous manner, and his condemnation would have been certain had not John of Gaunt and Lord Percy appeared in St. Paul's at his side. A quarrel ensued between the duke and the bishop of London, and Wycliffe escaped free for the time.

7. But his enemies among the clergy were too bitterly set against him to allow him so easy a triumph. They collected out of his sermons and lectures nineteen propositions, which they sent to the Pope, desiring his judgment upon them, and his orders how to proceed in the matter. These propositions, sent to the Pope towards the end of the year 1376, were as follows:—(1.) All mankind that have been since Christ, have not power to ordain that Peter and all his family should have political dominion over the world. (2.) God cannot give to man, for himself and his heirs, civil dominion for ever. (3.) Charters of human invention concerning a perpetual civil inheritance are impossible. (4.) Every one that continues in grace to the end, has not only a right to, but in fact enjoys all the good things of God. (5.) Man can only give ministerially to his son, whether natural or adopted in the school of Christ, temporal or eternal dominion. (6.) If God may, so may also temporal lords take away the goods of fortune from a delinquent Church. (7.) Whether the Church be in such a state or not, it is not my business to examine, but the business of temporal lords, who, if they find it in such a state, are to act boldly, and on the penalty of damnation to take away its temporalties. (8.) We know that it is impossible that the Vicar of Christ should, purely by his bulls, or by them with the will and consent of himself and his college of cardinals, qualify or disqualify any one. (9.) It is not possible for a man to be excommunicated unless he be first and principally excommunicated by himself. (10.) Nobody is excommunicated, suspended, or tormented with other censures, so that he is the worse for it, unless it be in the cause of God [or where God approves the cause]. (11.) Cursing or excommunication does not bind

published some years before this, and his sermons and lectures had turned much upon this subject. [1] *Introd. to Fascic. Zizan.*, xxvi.

simply, but only so far as it is denounced against an adversary of the law of Christ. (12.) Christ has given to his disciples no example of a power to excommunicate subjects principally for their denying them temporal things, but has rather given them an example to the contrary. (13.) The disciples of Christ have no power forcibly to exact temporal things by censures. (14.) It is not possible even for the absolute power of God to cause that if the Pope or any other pretends that he binds or looses at any rate, that he does therefore actually bind and loose. (15.) We ought to believe that then only does the Pope bind and loose, when he conforms himself to the law of Christ. (16.) This ought to be universally believed, that every priest rightly ordained has a power of administering every one of the sacraments,[1] and, by consequence, of absolving any contrite person from any sin. (17.) It is lawful for kings to take away temporalties from ecclesiastics who abuse them. (18.) Whether temporal lords or holy popes, or saints, or the head of the Church, which is Christ, have endowed the Church with the goods of fortune or of grace, and have excommunicated those who take away its temporalties, it is notwithstanding lawful, on account of the condition implied in the endowment, to spoil her of her temporalties proportionately to the offence. (19.) An ecclesiastic, yea, even the Pope of Rome, may lawfully be corrected by subjects and even the laity, and may also be accused and impeached by them."[2]

8. These accusations were sent to Pope Gregory XI. towards the end of 1376. The Pope having considered them, and being made aware of the state of things in England, issued on May 22, 1377, four bulls—one to the University of Oxford, commanding it no longer to tolerate the errors of John Wycliffe, which it had too long allowed; three to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Simon Sudbury) and the bishop of London (William Courtney), commanding them (1) to warn the king and the nobles of the errors of Wycliffe; (2) to arrest Wycliffe and keep him in strict

[1] Wycliffe, or at any rate some of his followers, carried this so far as to hold that a priest has the power of ordaining.

[2] Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, i. 353; *Fascic. Zizaniorum*, 245, *sq.*; Lewis, pp. 46-49.

custody; (3) or in case of his non-arrest to cite him to appear at the Papal court. In addition to these bulls, the Pope also addressed a letter to King Edward, informing him of what he had ordered the prelates to do, and requesting his aid and support.[1] The bulls and letter did not arrive in England till after the death of King Edward (June 21, 1377) and the succession of his youthful grandson. The bishops, finding themselves very severely censured in the Pope's bulls for their negligence in allowing these pestilent opinions so long impunity,[2] felt obliged to act in the matter. But, according to Walsingham, they proceeded without zeal or earnestness, like reeds shaken with the wind, and with words as soft as oil.[3] As to the University of Oxford, the Pope's bull was still more unacceptable there than it was to the bishops. Walsingham laments the degeneracy of the University, and how far it had declined from the wisdom of the ancients, inasmuch as it was long in debate among the authorities there, whether they should receive the papal bull at all, or reject it with contempt.[4] They elected at length to receive it, but in reality they did nothing in the matter. It is evident that Wycliffe was popular at Oxford, chiefly, probably, from his hostility to the begging friars who had become the bane and pest of the University.

9. Meantime, while the bishops and the University hesitated to act on the Pope's bulls, Wycliffe, informed of the charges made against him, was not slow in undertaking his justification and defence. As a known opponent of paying contributions to the Pope, his influence was great at court, where, in the scarcity of money, such payments were very unpopular. He appears to have been formally

[1] Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, i. 346-353.

[2] The Pope declares that the opinions of Wycliffe were similar to those of Marsilius of Padua and John of Ganduno, two lawyers, who, some twenty or thirty years before, had written treatises to uphold the imperial as against the papal power, and had been condemned in an Extravagant of Pope John XXII. [3] Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, i. 356.

[4] *Hist. Ang.*, i. 345. It is evident that at this moment, chiefly from political causes, England was on the verge of repudiating the Papacy altogether.

consulted on the question of the right of the Crown to withhold the papal payments. This, he maintained, was perfectly lawful, nay, incumbent on the State to do, on the principles of natural reason, on the principles of the gospel, on the principles of conscience. The endowments of our forefathers, he argues, were not for the Church in general, but for the Church of England. It would be an injustice to our forefathers in purgatory to alienate the alms given for the good of their souls. The Pope might lay the kingdom under an interdict, but God takes no account of such censures. It were better to restore the endowments to the founders, and to use what remained of them to establish the true peace of the Church.[1] And in addition to this defence of the general principle of repudiating the Pope's claims, Wycliffe put forth no less than three papers in defence of the actual opinions charged against him. One of these was presented to the Parliament which met October 13, 1377; another was probably intended for circulation among the clergy; and the third appeared somewhat later, being designed probably, as Dr. Shirley suggests, "as a sort of rejoinder in the controversy."[2]

10. The full defence of the inculpated opinions was thus well before the world before the bishops had taken any steps to bring the accused to trial. The beginning of the new reign may have produced hindrances to their action, but there is good reason to believe that the archbishop at any rate did not desire to move in the matter.[3] However, at length it was held to be necessary to do something, and on December 18 (1377) the bishops addressed a letter to the Chancellor of the University of Oxford reciting the Pope's bulls and enjoining him to aid in their execution. He was desired to assemble orthodox doctors, and to take counsel with them as to the errors imputed to

[1] *Fascic. Zizaniorum*, 258-271.

[2] See Shirley, *Introd. to Fascic. Zizan.*, pp. xxxi. xxxii.; *Fascic. Zizan.*, pp. 245, 481; Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, i. 357-364.

[3] Archbishop Sudbury was generally thought to favour novel opinions from his having, when bishop of London, spoken contemptuously of the value of pilgrimages to a party of Canterbury pilgrims whom he chanced to meet on their way to the shrine of St. Thomas.

Wycliffe, and to inform the bishops of the conclusions which they should arrive at, under seal. He was also to cite the said John Wycliffe to appear before the bishops at St. Paul's on the thirtieth court-day after the citation (Thursday, February 19, 1378.)[1] On that day the bishops were prepared to proceed to the trial, but instead of the accused doctor there appeared Sir Lewis Clifford, despatched by the Princess of Wales, acting as Regent of the kingdom, who desired them not to presume to determine anything against John Wycliffe. Struck with terror (according to the chronicler), they at once abandoned the business of their meeting. But Wycliffe was again summoned to appear at Lambeth, and there, probably some time in April, he came before his judges. Another impediment now arose. The citizens of London and "the very dregs of the populace," forced their way into the chapel, and such a scene of disorder was produced, that the bishops were obliged once more to abandon the trial. Wycliffe departed unmolested, and the death of the Pope happening soon after, he escaped all molestation for a time.[2]

11. It was unfortunate for the reputation of Wycliffe that he was complicated by a connection with John of Gaunt. This violent, overbearing, and lawless prince, whose power was necessarily great during the minority of the king, involved his supporter in very false positions. Thus, when the followers of the Duke of Lancaster invaded the sanctuary of Westminster Abbey, and in the midst of high mass slew one man on the spot and dragged away another to prison, the scandal of this atrocious deed seems to have been partially excused by Wycliffe.[3] And in like manner, when the Duke of Lancaster, furious at the quasi-

1 Lewis, *Records*, No. 17.

2 Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, i. 356. I have followed the chronicler, who evidently implies that there was first a meeting at St. Paul's, which was stopped by Clifford, and afterwards a meeting at Lambeth, which was stopped by the populace. Dr. Shirley only speaks of the meeting at Lambeth. Lewis's narrative is here a mass of confusion. He applies to the meeting at St. Paul's the interference of John of Gaunt and Lord Percy, which belongs to the meeting of the previous year.

3 See *Fascic. Zizan. Introd.*, p. xxxvi. ; Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, i. 375-9.

excommunication incurred for his sacrilege, had summoned a Parliament at Gloucester, and in revenge for the proceedings of the bishop of London proposed a large spoliation of Church property, this was doubtless held by all to be a practical application of the opinions of his friend and ally, John Wycliffe.[1] Wycliffe's doctrines as to Church property were, we know, merely ideal and theoretical, and not meant for practical application, but they were not on that account free from danger, and might easily be used as an excuse for spoliation. The Parliament, however, was not prepared to accept these revolutionary doctrines, and declined to sanction the robbery of the Church which the Duke of Lancaster desired.[2]

12. Happily causes now arose which withdrew Wycliffe from these dangerous theories, so tempting to the unscrupulous wielders of power, and led him into that path where his labours have been so eminently valuable, viz. that of a doctrinal reformer and a translator of Holy Scripture. The first of these causes was the commencement of the great schism in the Papacy. When there was again a Pope at Rome who excommunicated the Pope at Avignon, and with him his chief supporter the King of France, the enemy of England, then the English reverence for the Papacy was greatly revived, and Wycliffe no longer had the audience which he had before, when he called the Pope antichrist, and advocated the withholding all aid from him. He himself was also, perhaps unconsciously, influenced by the same feeling. Immediately after the establishment of a Roman Pope we find him sending a copy of his inculpated opinions to Rome, and declaring that he desired the judgment of the Roman Church upon them.[3] Another

[1] "Ostendi quod domini temporales potestatem habent subtrahendi suas eleemosynas collatas ecclesiæ, ipsâ illis eleemosynis abutente, et quod talis ablatio foret in casu plus meritoria quam prior collatio."—*Fasc. Ziz.*, p. 249.

[2] Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, i. 380.

[3] Volo non solum illas examinari per curiam Romanam sed per totam ecclesiam militantem et triumphantem, quæ est sancta mater ecclesia cui humiliter me submisi, a quâ absit me excludere Romunam ecclesiam, cum credo illam esse caput aliarum ecclesiarum militantium.—*De Veritate Scripturæ*: *Fasc. Ziz.*, *Introd.*, xxxiii.

perhaps more influential cause of the change in Wycliffe's teaching was the breaking out of the Wat Tyler rebellion, and the circumstances which accompanied it. The most tragical of these was the murder of Simon Sudbury, Archbishop of Canterbury. The archbishop was well known to Wycliffe, and had been on very friendly terms with him. He may even be regarded as to a certain extent a favourer of Wycliffe's views, if the condemnation which, when bishop of London, he passed upon the Canterbury pilgrimages is to be regarded as genuine.[1] Wycliffe would therefore be greatly shocked by the archbishop's tragical end, due as it was to his support as Lord Chancellor of the policy of John of Gaunt, and the imposition of the obnoxious poll-tax; and it is not improbable that he may have thought that the doctrines which he himself had taught as to property had had a tendency to encourage the rising of the commons. This at any rate was freely charged against him. John Ball, the seditious priest who was one of the leaders of the revolt, was spoken of as the apostle of Wycliffism.[2] Consequently, Wycliffe shrank from in any way countenancing such a false and dangerous notion, while at the same time he had no longer any sympathy for the Government, and had probably come to despair of the practical reform of the Church.[3]

13. Wycliffe now therefore determined to devote all his energies to theological works, and in the spring of 1381 he put out a paper containing the following propositions:—

(1.) The consecrated host which we see upon the altar

[1] See Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops*, iii. 250.

[2] See his alleged confession, *Fascic. Zizan.*, p. 273. Knighton says, "Hic habuit precursorem Joannem Balle, veluti Christus Ioannem Baptistam, qui vias suas in talibus opinionibus preparavit, et plurimos doctrinâ suâ ut dicitur perturbavit."—Knighton, p. 2644 (Ed. Twysden.) "Joannes Balle capellanus prædicator famosissimus habebatur apud laicos, qui per plura retroacta tempora verbum Dei insipienter sparserat, lollium cum tritico immiscendo, laicis nimis placens et libertati juris ecclesiastici et statûs quam maximè derogans, atque multos errores in ecclesiam Christi inter clerum et laicos execrabiliter introducens."—Knighton, p. 2634; Walsingham *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 32.

[3] Shirley, *Introd. to Fascic. Zizan.*, p. xlii.

is neither Christ nor any part of Him, but an efficacious sign of Him.

(2.) No passer-by can see Christ with his bodily eye in the consecrated Host, but can only see Him by faith.

(3.) Of old time the faith of the Roman Church was, according to the profession of Berengarius, that the bread and wine which remain after benediction are the consecrated Host.

(4.) The Eucharist has, by virtue of the sacramental words as well the body as the blood of Christ truly and really in every part of it.

(5.) Transubstantiation, identification, and impanation—which terms are made use of by those baptists of signs in the matter of the Eucharist—are not to be established from Scripture.

(6.) It is in opposition to the opinions of saints to assert that there is the accident without the subject in the true Host.

(7.) The sacrament of the Eucharist is in its nature bread and wine, containing by virtue of the sacramental words, the true body and blood of Christ in every part of it.

(8.) The sacrament of the Eucharist is in figure the body and blood of Christ into which the bread and wine are transubstantiated, which remain something [1] after consecration, although, as the faithful believe, their nature is laid asleep.

(9.) The existence of accident without subject is not probable. If it be, God is annihilled, and every article of the Christian faith perishes.

(10.) Any person or sect is heretical which shall obstinately maintain that the sacrament of the altar is bread existing by itself, and thus in its nature more abject and imperfect than horse bread.[2]

(11.) Whosoever shall pertinaciously defend that the

[1] Cujus remanet aliquitas.

[2] A scholastical view on which Wycliffe and his followers dwelt much—namely, that to abstract substance from the accidents, and to leave the accidents without subject, was to degrade the nature of the thing thus treated.

said sacrament is an accident, a quality or quantity, or an aggregation of these, falls into the heresy above spoken of.

(12.) Wheaten bread, in which alone it is lawful to consecrate, is in its nature infinitely more perfect than bean bread or rat's bread, both of which are in their nature more perfect than an accident.[1]

14. These propositions of Wycliffe would seem to some at Oxford to be as great heresies scholastically as doctrinally. To deny the possibility of accidents existing without substance was as bad as to declare that the Eucharist was a true sacrament. The University of Oxford, therefore, possessed as it was then with the importance of scholastical subtleties, at once proceeded to call in question Wycliffe's dogmata. He selected three propositions (the fourth, the eighth, and the ninth), which he undertook to maintain in the schools. In the discussion which followed Wycliffe argued that the mode by which the body of Christ is in the sacrament is virtual, "as a king in his whole kingdom." His chief aim, he said, was to recall the Church from idolatry, inasmuch as the Church has for many years gone wrong on this question. That the words of consecration do not take away the material bread and wine, which remain in their own nature as well after consecration as before. He illustrated this by examples, *e.g.* a sinner is changed into a good man, but remains the same man as before. Gregory or Innocent is made a Pope; he is still the same man as before. Wood is converted into an image, water into ice, the same substance remains. Thus in the sacrament the material body of Christ is not present, but Christ is present figuratively or virtually, as the Baptist was Elias. To say that accidents can exist without a subject Wycliffe asserted was to put that bread below horse bread[2] or rat's bread, for these are substances, and substance is higher than accident. Wycliffe's doctrine was, after his defence of it had been heard, condemned as pestiferous by the Chancellor of Oxford

[1] *Fascic. Zizan.*, p. 105.

[2] "Quia quodlibet horum est substantia, et illud sacramentum visibile est accidens sine substantiâ, sed substantia in quantum hujusmodi est perfectius accidente, et accidens infinitum abjectius substantiâ."—*Fasc. Ziz.*, 109.

(William Berton) and an assembly of doctors of theology and canon law, and a formal and argumentative sentence, condemnatory of it, was published in the University, which prohibited the advocating of such opinions under the penalty of excommunication and of suspension from all scholastical acts.[1]

15. Upon hearing this sentence Wycliffe at once appealed to the king, hoping no doubt to obtain the support of the Duke of Lancaster in this matter, as he had obained it before in the matter of the Church property dispute. But things had assumed a different complexion since that time. It was no longer the policy of John of Gaunt to affront and attack the Church. His previous quarrel with the prelates had indeed been merely on political and social grounds. There is no reason to suppose that in doctrinal opinions he differed at all from the superstitious notions prevalent in his day. Wycliffe was at once informed that he need expect no further support from him. The duke even came down to Oxford to tell him so, and to urge him to yield to the University authorities, and to speak no more on the subject of the Eucharist. This served only to bring out the boldness and earnestness of Wycliffe's character. He "replied by his memorable confession."[1] In this he maintains the real presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist in the strongest way. He is there more really and in a different mode from His presence in the other sacraments, but yet not substantially or corporeally. He declares that he agrees with Scripture, the ancient doctors, and the decrees of the Roman Church. The bread is by miracle Christ's body; and just as in the Incarnation there were two perfect natures in one person, so is it in the Eucharist. The sacrament of the altar retains the nature of bread and wine, but is sacramentally the body and blood of Christ. He produces seven witnesses to this doctrine—Ignatius, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, the decree of Pope Nicholas II., the Canon of the Mass. He calls upon the

[1] *Fascic. Zizan.*, pp. 106-113. Of the twelve doctors who agreed to the decree adverse to Wycliffe, two were monks, six were friars, two were secular theologians, and two were jurists.

[2] Shirley, *Introd. to Fasc. Ziz.*, p. xliii.

faithful to weigh these testimonies, and to consider how the opposite doctrine dishonours Christ's body, and he ends by denouncing woe against those who prefer the teaching of the later to that of the earlier Church.[1] Wycliffe's bold and able defence of his doctrine made a great impression at Oxford. He was always popular there as the opponent of the Friars, who had ever been the troublers of the University, and against whom all the secular regents were deeply incensed. A new chancellor and new proctors at Oxford espoused his cause, and the University took no further steps against him. But his opponents were not to be so easily silenced. Believing, as they no doubt did, that the very fundamentals of religion were at stake, they addressed themselves to the Primate.

16. Archbishop Sudbury had now been succeeded in the primacy by Courtney, bishop of London. Courtney was a man proud of his ancient family—one of the most illustrious in Europe—prouder perhaps still of his high ecclesiastical position—a thorough High Churchman—one who ventured to publish the papal bulls at the risk of incurring the penalties of a Præmunire,[2] and who hesitated not to place himself in opposition to John of Gaunt, the most powerful man in the kingdom. Wycliffe had already been summoned before Courtney, when, under the Pope's directions, he and the Primate had undertaken to judge him for his opinions as to church property. On that occasion he had been rudely rescued by John of Gaunt, and, when again summoned, had been carried away by a noisy crowd. He had also defended, or at least palliated, the invasion of sanctuary by John of Gaunt's followers, which the bishop of London had greatly resented. On every ground, then—as the propounder of novel opinions—as the friend of John of Gaunt—Wycliffe was specially obnoxious to the new Primate. Just as with Archbishop Sudbury he had stood well, so with Courtney the most unfavourable view of his conduct and writings was sure to be entertained. The teachings of Wycliffe on the Eucharist, novel and startling as they were to the men of that generation, were

[1] *Fascic. Zizan.*, pp. 115-132; Lewis, p. 323.

[2] Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops*, iii. 326.

such as to invite the immediate action of the archbishop. Courtney also felt the more constrained to act promptly, as the teaching, held to be so mischievous, was now not confined to Wycliffe. There was already a "sect of the Lollards."[1] Wycliffe had a large body of adherents both in the University and outside it, who preached his doctrines with the greatest zeal, and constantly came into collision with the Friars and others who maintained the opposite views. He had made the attempt to form these supporters into a regular *order*, called "the poor priests," or the "simple priests," who were to be "poor without mendicancy, to combine the flexible unity, the swift obedience of an order, with the free and constant mingling with the poor;"[2] and while Rigge, Hereford, Aston, Repyngdon, and Bedeman upheld his doctrines in the University of Oxford, were to make the circuit of England, spreading everywhere the new teaching.[3] The matter therefore, was, in the opinion of many a very pressing one, and the archbishop was called upon from various quarters to apply an effectual remedy.[4] At the meeting therefore of the Parliament of May 1382 the archbishop summoned his provincial council to meet at Black Friars, May 19, 1382.

17. The council was ushered in by an earthquake, which caused great dismay among the assembled divines, but was dexterously turned by the Primate into a sign of encouragement to them to proceed to purge the kingdom of heresies. Their method of proceeding was to examine a certain string of propositions collected or supposed to be collected from the writings of Wycliffe,[5] to condemn them

[1] *Fascic. Zizan.*, p. 272. Various derivations, more or less absurd, have been suggested for this word. No one acquainted with the literature of the time could, however, hesitate to derive it from *lolium*.

[2] Shirley, *Introd. to Fasc. Ziz.*, p. xl. See the rules given in Wycliffe's *Trialogus* for the poor priests, p. xli., note.

[3] Qui dixit quod erat certa comitiva de sectâ et doctrinâ Wycclyf qui conspiraverant quandam confederationem, et se ordinaverant circuere totam Angliam prædicando prædicti Wycclef materias quas docuerat, et sic tota Anglia consentiret suæ perversæ doctrinæ."—*Fasc. Ziz.*, p. 274.

[4] *Fasc. Ziz.*, pp. 272-275.

[5] These propositions seem, upon the whole, fairly to represent the views of Wycliffe.

as heretical or false, and then to prohibit the teaching of such doctrines under the penalty of excommunication. The propositions were as follows:—

(1.) That the substance of material bread and wine remains, after consecration, in the sacrament of the altar.[1]

(2.) That accidents cannot remain without a subject in the same sacrament.

(3.) That Christ is not in the sacrament of the altar identically, truly and really in proper corporal presence.

(4.) That if a bishop or a priest be in mortal sin, he cannot ordain, consecrate, or baptize.

(5.) That if a man be fittingly contrite, all outward confession is superfluous or useless to him.

(6.) That it is not set down in the Gospel that Christ ordained the mass.

(7.) That God ought to obey the devil.

(8.) That if a Pope be a false and bad man, and consequently a limb of the devil, he has no power over the faithful of Christ,[2] given to him by any, except perchance by Cæsar.

(9.) That after Urban VI. none is to be received as Pope, but all are to live, in the manner of the Greeks, by their own laws.

(10.) That it is against Scripture that Churchmen should have temporal possessions.

These ten propositions were condemned as heresies. The fourteen following were condemned as errors.

(11.) That no prelate ought to excommunicate any one, unless he first knows that he is excommunicated by God.

[1] "I say as these saints do, and trow as Holy Church troweth, and teacheth, that the Sacred host is verily the Body of Christ."—*Apology for Lollards*, p. 46.

[2] Wycliffe did not hold that the Pope was Antichrist absolutely, but only conditionally, *i.e.* if he were an evil liver. Thus in the Apology, "This I grant now, that the lawfully ordained [Pope] is Christ's vicar, either when he doeth or biddeth anything in the name of Christ, as if Christ did that by him, that then he is the vicar of Christ indeed, and then it is to obey to him as Christ's vicar, and as Jesu Christ."—*Ib.*, p. 68.

(12.) That he who thus excommunicates becomes thereby an heretic or [himself] excommunicated.[1]

(13.) That a prelate excommunicating a clerk who has appealed to the king and the council of the kingdom, is thereby a traitor to God, the king, and the kingdom.

(14.) That those who cease to preach or to hear the Word of God or the Gospel preached on account of the excommunication of men, are excommunicated, and in the day of judgment will be held traitors to God.

(15.) That it is permitted to any one, whether deacon or priest, to preach the Word of God without the authority of the Apostolical See, or a catholic bishop, or some other authority which is sufficiently allowed.

(16.) That none is a civil lord, none a bishop, none a prelate, while he is in mortal sin.

(17.) That temporal lords can at their will take away temporal goods from Churchmen habitually delinquent, and that the people may at their will correct delinquent lords.

(18.) That tithes are pure alms, and that parishioners can hold them back on account of the sins of curates, and give them as they please.

(19.) That special prayers applied to one person by prelates or religious persons do not more profit such person than general prayers do, other things being equal.

(20.) That any one entering any private religious rule, is made more useless and more unfit to observe God's commandments.

(21.) That saints instituting religious rules, whether possessionary or mendicant, have sinned in such institution.

(22.) That religious persons living in private religious rules are not of the Christian religion.[2]

[1] "He that curseth any man or denounceth him cursed, when he is not cursed, he breaketh God's binding, beareth false witness against his neighbour. This showeth itself sooth, and other reasons prove it well."—*Apology*, p. 40.

[2] "When the vow of the religious is to wilful bodily poverty and obedience and chastity, to be kept, but now our religious liveth and floweth among all men most in delights, and aboundeth in worldly riches, and taketh to them worldly honours; certainly they have feignedly and falsely another vow against the Gospel, or else they break their

(23.) That friars are bound to get their living by the labour of their hands and not by mendicancy.

(24.) That he who gives alms to friars, or to a friar when he preaches, is excommunicated as well as he who receives the alms.[1]

18. Meantime, while the Convocation was sitting at Blackfriars, the greatest excitement prevailed at Oxford, the birthplace of these opinions. Wycliffe had many able supporters there. Nicholas Herford, a master in theology, boldly advocated all his views, and is said, in his sermon on Ascension Day, to have openly exhorted the people to rescue him from his enemies. Philip Repyngdon, a doctor of divinity,[2] declared that he was willing to defend all Wycliffe's opinions in the matter of morals, but as for his doctrine on the Eucharist he would lay his finger on his lips, until God had enlightened the minds of the clergy. This doctor was appointed by the chancellor, Dr. Rigge, to preach before the University on Corpus Christi Day. The friars and their adherents were in a great commotion, and sent a pressing request to the archbishop to order the condemnation of the inculpated propositions to be published before the sermon could be delivered. The archbishop at once assented. He sent the condemned propositions in a letter to Peter Stokes, a Carmelite, and the leader of the anti-Wickliffe party, and desired they might be published (May 28). In a second letter to the chancellor, dated two days after, he desires him to assist Peter Stokes, and to see to the publication of the condemnation of the propositions on Corpus Christi Day, before Repyngdon's sermon. At the same time he chides Dr. Rigge for the favour he had already shown to Herford. The chancellor was by no means inclined to assent to this direction. He maintained that the University of Oxford was free, and not under the domi-

vow, and whether it be so or so, the vow is against the Gospel and damnable."—*Apology*, p. 104.

[1] *Fascic. Zizan.*, 277-282; Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 58, 59; Knighton, p. 2648 (Ed. Twysden).

[2] Afterwards nicknamed Rampington on account of the fury with which he persecuted the opinions of the Lollards (when bishop of Lincoln), which now he upheld.

nation of any prelate. The Friars, and notably Friar Peter, were the great troublers of the peace. He refused to assist them in stifling the preaching of sound doctrine. In order to defend Repyngdon, the chancellor is said to have attended the church of St. Frideswide, accompanied by a hundred armed men. The doctor was allowed to preach Wickliffist doctrine without let or hindrance, and Peter Stokes, writing to the archbishop, declares that he can do no more, that he feels that he is in danger of his life, and prays the archbishop for protection.[1]

19. Archbishop Courtney was not the man to allow his authority and that of his synod to be so openly defied. He summoned Stokes to Lambeth without delay. Dr. Rigge, the Chancellor of Oxford, was also summoned. On June 12 the Convocation met, and Dr. Rigge was accused on various grounds of favouring the party of Wycliffe and the sect of the Lollards, and of countenancing Herford and Repyngdon. He was found guilty of contempt of the authority of the Church, but he submitted himself, and asked pardon and was excused.[2] He then received a mandate from the archbishop, by which he was to regulate his administration of the University for the future. It stated that as certain conclusions were condemned, to which Rigge was known to be inclined, the chancellor should be careful not to molest any clergy, regular or secular, who had aided in the matter, and should not permit such doctrines to be taught in the University, nor allow John Wycliffe, Nicholas Herford, John Aston, Philip Repyngdon, or Lawrence Bedeman, "who are notoriously suspected of heresies, or any other person thus suspected or defamed, to preach, but should suspend them from every scholastical act until they have established their innocence in this matter before you."[3] Another mandate followed, ordering the chancellor to publish in St. Mary's Church, and in the schools, the condemned propositions, in English and Latin, and to make strict inquiry in the University for all favourers of such views, and to compel them to abjure. The chancellor remonstrated, declaring that he dared not for the peril of his life publish them. "Then," said the archbishop, "the

[1] *Fascic. Zizan.*, pp. 296-301. [2] *Ib.*, pp. 304-308. [3] *Ib.*, p. 310.

University is a fautor of heresies, which does not permit Catholic truths to be published." The next day the Chancellor of Oxford was summoned before the council, and commanded by Sir Richard le Scroope, the Lord Chancellor, to obey every order of the archbishop, and a royal brief was issued, confirming the order previously made by the archbishop.[1] By another brief the chancellor was ordered to quash the sentence which he had pronounced against Henry Crumpe, a Cistercian monk, and not in any way to molest him, or Peter Stokes, or Stephen Patryngton, for anything they had done or should do, to oppose the doctrine of Wycliffe.[2]

20. Under the combined pressure of the ecclesiastical and civil authorities the chancellor Rigge yielded. He published the condemnation of the propositions, and intimated to Herford and Repyngdon that they were suspended from academical acts. Upon this the two censured divines at once proceeded to appeal for aid to the Duke of Lancaster. John of Gaunt, however, had long ceased to take any interest in the matter. He had never been really in favour of a reformation of doctrine in the Church, but had merely espoused Wycliffe's cause from political reasons. Herford and Repyngdon quickly found that they had nothing to hope for from him. They therefore betook themselves to the archbishop, and handed in an answer to the inculpated propositions. They were ordered to appear before the Convocation on June 20, when their answers were taken into consideration. These apparently condemn the whole of the propositions either as heresies or errors, but their answers are drawn in such a way that they were probably intended to leave them a loophole for retractation. This at any rate was the opinion of the archbishop and his assistant divines, who, after having questioned the two appellants, condemned their answers as erroneous and evasive, but deferred their sentence for eight days.[3] The conduct of John Aston differed from that of Herford and Repyngdon. When brought before

[1] *Fascic. Zizan.*, p. 312.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 314 ; Lewis's *Wycliffe*, p. 316.
[3] *Fascic. Zizan.*, pp. 319-329.

the archbishop and his assessors, he refused to make any answers whatever to the propositions, and was condemned as a heretic, and handed over to the secular arm.[1] Upon this Aston published an appeal to the people in the form of a broadsheet, which he caused to be distributed. In this he declares that his belief was that "the bread which the priest holds in his hands becomes, or is made by virtue of the sacramental words, truly and really the same body of Christ numerically which was taken and born from the Virgin, which suffered and died on the cross, lay three days in the tomb, on the third day rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God, and at the day of judgment shall come to judge the quick and the dead. Moreover, I believe generally on that matter whatsoever Holy Scripture determines either in words or sense, or the holy Church of God determines. Wherefore, being required to say specially what I thought concerning that proposition—'The material bread remains in the sacrament of the altar after consecration'—I protested that I had never put forth that proposition, taught it, or preached it. For I knew that that matter and speculation on it transcends my understanding, and therefore I believe as much as Holy Scripture teaches to be expressly believed concerning it. On that subject, and on all others touching the Catholic faith not expressed in Holy Scripture, I believe as holy Mother Church believes. Therefore I pray all Christian folk to bear me witness and to pray for me."[2] This appeal to popular feeling was met by the clergy by a declaration that it was not for this doctrine that Aston was condemned, but because he would not confess that the body of Christ is in the sacrament of the altar "identically, truly and really in proper corporal presence," and that "after consecration there remaineth not

[1] *Fascic. Zizan.*, p. 329. It appears that his trial gave rise to a popular outbreak. Walsingham says, "Sed et ipsum archiepiscopum irreverens turba præsumpsit in civitate sedentem impedire cum processum fecisset contra quendam Johannem Aston magistrum in artibus et artissimum sequacem Johannis Wyclif; effractis foribus conclavis in quo idem archiepiscopus sedit cum turbâ Theologiæ et Juris Professorum."—*Hist. Ang.*, ii. 65.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 330.

the substance of material bread and wine in that venerable sacrament." Although Aston had shown a bold front, he was evidently not of a temper to be a martyr, and on further consideration he accepted all the Convocation formulæ, and obtained his pardon. As for Herford and Repyngdon, whose sentence had been deferred, they were on July 1 at Canterbury pronounced heretical, and excommunicated. Later on in the year (November 19), when the archbishop held a Convocation at St. Frideswide's in Oxford, Repyngdon recanted, and Herford, though holding out somewhat longer, at length yielded. He entered the Carthusian order, and died in it.[1] Repyngdon became abbot of Leicester, then bishop of Lincoln. Finally he culminated as a cardinal of the Roman Church.[2]

21. Meantime, while such vigorous measures were taken to suppress the rising sect of the Lollards, what was the condition and employment of the head and originator of these inculpated doctrines? Why was not John Wycliffe summoned before the Convocation, and why were no proceedings taken against him at Oxford?[3] By some the reason of this is set down to his illness,[4] but this would not have prevented his being summoned, although it might have hindered his attendance. The probable reason was the fear of the influence which he might still possess both in the court and among the people. For the instruction of these latter, he was now pouring out from his retreat at Lutterworth, with ceaseless activity,[5] his English Tracts, and carrying on his greatest and most noble work, the translation of the whole Bible into the English tongue. Portions of this were doubtless appearing during the year

[1] Wood, *Annals*, i. 510. [2] Lewis, *Life of Wycliffe*, pp. 261-267.

[3] Dr. Shirley says, "That some proceedings were taken against Wycliffe himself at Oxford, we learn from the so-called Knighton (Col. 2649), but it is not easy to assign the true date to them, the more so as the chronicler himself does not understand them."—*Introd. to Fasc. Ziz.*, p. xliv. note. [4] Lewis, p. 113.

[5] The enormous amount of Wycliffe's literary labours may be best judged of by Dr. Shirley's "Catalogue of the Original Works of John Wycliffe" (Oxford, 1865), which is an attempt to bring together a list of his works, both Latin and English. As to the date and arrangement of these works, scarce anything has as yet been accomplished.

1382, as well as those striking English treatises, in which the reformer appears as the father of English prose, as Geoffrey Chaucer was of English verse. And though his enemies might for a season refrain from attacking him, he did not hesitate to launch his shafts against them. He stigmatises the Convocation sometimes as the "Council of Friars," sometimes as the "Earthquake Council;" declares of some of the propositions that they were invented about Catholic men that their reputation might be blackened; that poor priests were slandered with these errors, and false opinions attributed to them to make lords hate them; that to say that they preached that the people might correct delinquent lords at their pleasure is a silly prattling of the Friars' invention.[1] The startling propositions which had been professedly extracted from Wycliffe's writings, no doubt proved to him the necessity of explaining or balancing some of the statements which he had put forth. For instance, he explains in his *Great Sentence of Curse expounded*, that his doctrine that temporal lords may take away their goods from delinquent Churchmen, merely meant that in case of a fine being inflicted on a clerk, the king's officers might seize their goods for payment.[2] With regard to this and kindred topics—the most questionable part of Wycliffe's teaching—the remarks of one who has thoroughly studied his writings deserve careful consideration. "The theory of dominion involving the relation of Church and State which stands numbered by our author among Wycliffe's earliest heresies, and which occupies a prominent position in all the later condemnations of his opinions, ought never, in justice to its author, to be published without his own declaration that it was put forth as an ideal, and with the full admission that it was incompatible, in many of its results, with the existing state of society. Being an ideal, it is the more remarkable to find it thoroughly feudal in its whole conception. Dominion being not a right or a power, or anything external, but a habit of the rational nature,[3] can, in its highest and purest sense,

[1] Lewis, p. 118.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 121.

[3] "Dominium est habitudo naturæ rationalis secundum quam denominatur suo præfici servienti."—*De Dominio Divinio*, i., cap. i. MS., Denis, ccccv. (Dr. Shirley's note).

belong to God alone. He deals it out in fief, as it were, to men in their several stations and offices, on condition of obedience to His commandments. Mortal sin therefore breaks the link, and deprives man of his authority. Thus no man in a state of mortal sin has in strict right either priesthood or lordship, a principle which applies, of course, in its degree, to every human being. This is the meaning of Wycliffe's favourite expression, that all dominion is founded in grace."[1] To this theory, so liable to be misunderstood, and to lead to the most mischievous consequences, Wycliffe no doubt supplied corrections, such as, that as God pleased to allow the power of the wicked in this world, men are bound to submit to it. This he expressed in the paradoxical and apparently irreverent proposition that "God ought to obey the devil." Again, he appended to the proposition that neither bishop nor priest could do the acts of their office when in mortal sin, the salvo that as a *matter of fact* the sacraments were received from such priests "inasmuch as they be not the authors of the sacraments."[2] To set forth propositions *apparently* contradictory did not trouble one who had passed his life amidst the subtleties of the schoolmen, whose chief delight was to enunciate a paradox startling to all ordinary minds, and then to establish and defend it by verbal logomachies. But in fact the scholastic mind and training of Wycliffe eminently suited him for the work he had to do. His work was not to establish and teach, but to shake and question. And while he did this, as it were, with one hand, with the other he provided material for the formation and establishment of sound views in the future. He gave his countrymen the inestimable blessing of the vernacular Scriptures. The translations of Scripture made into the English spoken before the Conquest would not at that period be generally understood, even if they were accessible, and though versions of small portions of the Scripture may have been locally known (such as that of Richard Rolle of Hampole of the Psalms, and portions of Isaiah), yet very little knowledge of Holy Writ was to be found among those who could not read Latin. A certain

[1] Shirley, *Introd. to Fascic. Zizan.*, p. lxii. [2] Lewis, p. 144.

amount of acquaintance with the main facts of the Scripture was no doubt prevalent, due principally to the rhyming manuals which were common and very popular.[1] But manuals in doggerel rhyme were but a poor substitute for the grand diction of the Scriptures, even if the manual were fairly made, and did not misrepresent rather than represent the text. Wycliffe gave to his countrymen once and for ever the power of bringing to an infallible touchstone all the Manuals, Prymers, Layfolks' Mass Books, Legends, and other little devout and instructive volumes, of which many no doubt always existed in the land. Wycliffe's version, made from the Vulgate, but clearly formed on the model of the old English version of Bede, wherever it was available for a pattern, has a simple grandeur about it, which, through the medium of Tyndale, has been imported in great degree into the version now prevalent. It was truly a κτῆμα ἐς ἀει for his Church and country.[2]

22. While engaged unceasingly in his invaluable labours at Lutterworth, Wycliffe received a summons from Pope Urban VI.[3] to appear before him at Rome. The enemies of the great reformer doubtless thought that by this means they would easily crush him. Before the Pope Wycliffe's great friends could not help him, nor could the popular voice be an efficient ally. It is probable that Wycliffe, whose character was one of remarkable boldness, would not have shrunk from meeting the Pope, had he not been disabled by illness. But soon after going to reside at Lutterworth he had had a stroke of paralysis. From this he recovered, and was able to continue his astonishing literary activity by the aid of John Purveye, his amanuensis, but the seizure quite incapacitated him from making a

[1] See Chapter XXIV.

[2] A magnificent edition of Wycliffe's translation has been published by the University of Oxford.

[3] This was the Pope who had authorised and blessed the ludicrous expedition led by Bishop Spencer of Norwich, which he called a Crusade. It was intended to be directed against the Antipope and his supporters in France, but it only availed to cost the lives of a good many ignorant zealots, and cover the name of Crusade with a ridicule from which it never recovered. For fuller account, see page 448.

long journey. In a letter remaining in both Latin and English he explains the situation. He would gladly, he says, tell all true men his belief, much more the Pope, who is more obliged than other men to the keeping of the Gospel, inasmuch as he is the highest vicar that Christ has here on earth. But this high position must be accompanied by a corresponding height of devotion, otherwise no respect is due to him, for no man should follow the Pope, nor any saint in heaven, but inasmuch as he follows Christ. He would counsel the Pope to leave worldly affairs to his lords, and bid his clergy do the same, and give himself to preaching the Gospel. If he could travel in his own person he would, God willing, go to the Pope. But Christ has willed it otherwise, and it is to be supposed that the Pope will not be Antichrist and resent what Christ has done. He will pray for him that he may be kept in the right way.[1]

23. There is a quiet dignity about this letter which well befits the grand position which Wycliffe now occupied. But his failing health and his unceasing labour were rapidly bringing his career to a close. "No friendly hand," says his most able commentator, "has left us any, even the slightest, memorial of the life and death of the great reformer. A spare, frail, emaciated frame, a quiet temper, a conversation 'most innocent,' the charm of every rank—he possessed, as few ever did, the qualities which give men power over their fellows."[2] The senseless and furious abuse of the chroniclers,[3] his extraordinary popularity at Oxford, the support he gained from men of power who cared nothing for the real import of his teaching, all attest this. From his quiet home at Lutterworth, by means of his bands of "poor priests," who everywhere, clad in their russet gowns, carried his pithy tracts and preached his doctrines, Wycliffe was already moving the heart of England, and opening men's eyes to see the monstrous absurdities with which long centuries of ignorance and superstition had encrusted the religion of Christ. Then, in the midst

[1] Lewis, *Coll.*, No. 23. [2] Shirley, *Introd. to Fasc. Ziz.*, p. xlvi.

[3] Walsingham calls him "Organum diabolicum, hostis ecclesiæ, confusio vulgi, hæreticorum eidolum, hypocritarum speculum, schismatis incentor, odii seminator, mendacii fabricator."—*Hist. Ang.*, ii. 119.

of this great work, he was suddenly summoned away. On Innocents' Day (December 29, 1384), as he was hearing mass in his church at Lutterworth, he was struck by another stroke of paralysis, and fell speechless to the ground. In two days' time, on the eve of the Feast of the Circumcision (December 31, 1384), he died. He was buried at Lutterworth, but a bishop of Lincoln (Flemyng) afterwards disgraced himself by carrying out the mean and paltry revenge decreed against Wycliffe by the Council of Constance—the burner of John Huss and Jerome of Prague. His body was exhumed, his bones burnt, and the ashes thrown into a running stream.[1] It was perhaps supposed, as it was certainly hoped, that the doctrines and influence of Wycliffe would disappear and perish like the ashes of his bones. But in this there was a miscalculation. The spirit of revolt against superstitious doctrines, which were founded not on Scripture nor on primitive antiquity, but on the enunciations of the Church of the day, once evoked, could not again be suppressed. Wycliffe had evoked this spirit, and had at the same time supplied the material for its support in the vernacular Scriptures and his English tracts. Henceforth, in spite of persecution, of civil war, of grievous social corruptions, this spirit still struggled on, until the times of greater freedom and light were reached. It formed a substratum on which the influences of the sixteenth century could work. Had Wycliffe never stood forward as a bold athlete to combat the mischiefs of his day, the work of the sixteenth century would scarce have been possible.

[1] *Narratio Thomæ Gascoigne*, Lewis, *Coll.*, No. 25.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE REVOLT AGAINST MEDIÆVAL DOCTRINE—THE LOLLARDS.

1384-1431.

1. William Swinderby. 2. Courtney attempts to obtain legal checks to Lollardism. 3. Its rapid advance. 4. Bishop Spencer's Crusade. 5. Its effect in helping forward Lollardism. 6. Attempt to check Lollardism in Parliament of 1388. 7. Lollardism at Leicester. 8. Continued progress. 9. Influence of the Friars threatened. 10. Re-enactment of the Statute of Provisors. 11. Re-enactment of the Statute of Præmunire. 12. The conclusions of the Lollards presented to Parliament. 13. Ecclesiastical and political changes. 14. Statute *De hæreticis comburendis*. 15. Burning of William Sawtry. 16. Recantation of John Purveye. 17. Trial of William Thorpe. 18. Arundel's Constitutions. 19. Parliamentary attacks on the Church. 20. Process against Sir John Oldcastle. 21. Statute of 1414. 22. Continued persecution of the Lollards. 23. The special injustice used towards them. 24. The Council of Constance.

1. With the exception of the Oxford doctors, the only one of Wycliffe's followers who seems to have been proceeded against during his lifetime was William Swinderby. Swinderby had lived as a hermit, and had acquired some fame for sanctity; but, attracted by Wycliffe's teaching, he had left his solitude and established himself at Leicester, where, together with John Waytestathe and William Smith, he preached Wycliffist doctrine at the Chapel of St. John, near the Lepers' Hospital. The points which Swinderby seems especially to have dwelt upon were those most questionable parts of Wycliffe's system, put out by him rather as a scholastic exercise than for practical application, viz., that it was right to refuse tithes to clergy of evil life, and that the unworthiness of the minister hindered the efficacy of the sacraments. The bishop of Lincoln, on report being made to him, inhibited Swinderby from preaching in the chapel, upon which he took up his station

by the roadside, declaring that he would preach there in spite of all the bishops. Vast crowds were attracted to hear him. The preacher was, however, soon summoned to Lincoln to answer for his contumaciousness. Three friars were appointed by the bishop as commissioners to hear the case. Swinderby had not much indulgence to expect from such judges. He was condemned, and would probably have been excommunicated and degraded had not John of Gaunt, who chanced to be at Lincoln, interceded with the bishop in his favour. Swinderby was set at liberty on the undertaking that he should read publicly in eight churches of the diocese his recantation on eleven points touching the question as to how sinful living affects the clerical office. He appears to have done this,[1] and to have returned to Leicester (according to Knighton) terribly dejected. Soon afterwards he retired to Coventry, where he resumed his preaching, and became more popular than ever. At length, however, he was driven out of that diocese with disgrace by the bishop and clergy.[2] Some few years after this we again meet with Swinderby in the diocese of Hereford (1391). In the process then instituted against him he declares that he never held the opinions which were imputed to him at his former trial; that his trial was very disorderly and unjust, and that "for dread of death and for fleshly counsel" he had agreed to admit the charges. He was condemned at Hereford, and pronounced a heretic. He appealed to the King and Council, and also addressed a letter to the Parliament.[3]

2. The practical immunity enjoyed by the disciples of Wycliffe during the first years of their existence was not due to any disinclination on the part of Archbishop Courtney to use severity, but is rather to be accounted for by the fact that there did not exist in England at that time any machinery for bringing severity to bear upon heretics. Up to this period religious persecution had been

[1] Walsingham, however, says, "Sæviens turba demens adeo episcopum deterrebat ut nihil auderet agere contra eum."—*Hist. Ang.*, ii. 55.

[2] Knighton, *De Event. Ang. Col.*, 2665-2671; Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 53-56; *Fascic. Zizan.*, 334-340.

[3] Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, i. 531-541.

almost unknown in England, and it is doubtful whether any one had ever been capitally punished for heresy.[1] There was no statutory power to arrest, try, far less to punish with death. The Church courts might of course proceed according to the canons, but their action was slow and difficult, and always liable to be interfered with by powerful protectors of the accused. The archbishop determined to endeavour to remedy this difficulty. He procured a Statute to be passed by the Lords in the Parliament of 1382, which enacted that, on certificate from the bishops, the Chancellor should commission the sheriffs and others to compel the accused person to satisfy the demands of the Church. Such a Statute could not safely be brought into the Commons' House, where Lollardy was very popular, and it was therefore attempted to pass it by the sole authority of the Lords. Naturally the Commons resented this, and protested against it, and the Statute was practically cancelled in the October session of the same year in which it was passed.[2] Conscious, probably, that his imperfect legislation might turn out to be of no great value, the archbishop endeavoured to fortify his position by royal letters-patent. In July 1382 he obtained from the king letters-patent giving authority to the archbishop and his suffragans "to arrest and detain in their own prisons, or in any other, at their discretion, all and singular who privately or publicly preach the condemned conclusions, wherever they may be found, till they shall repent of the pravities of these errors and heresies."[3] The Primate also addressed a letter to his suffragans, exhorting them to use active means for stopping the advance of error and heresy, and to inhibit all heretical preachers.[4]

3. But no real check was produced by these measures to the advancing tide of Lollardism. Many men of influence and standing in the country had adopted the new views. Sir William Nevile, Sir Lewis Clifford, Sir John Clanevon, Sir Richard Sturry, Sir Thomas Latimer, Sir John Montagu, are said by Walsingham to have favoured these opinions.[5] Knighton mentions, in addition to these, Sir

[1] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, ii. 470.
[2] *Ib.*
[3] Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 156.
[4] *Ib.*, iii. 158.
[5] Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 159.

John Trussell, Sir John Pecche, and Sir Reginald de Hylton. These knights were ready, at all times, to defend and support the Lollard preachers; and when any of them came to the place where they were, they would cause all the people to assemble and listen to their teaching, so that the new doctrines spread with the greatest rapidity. It is said that the half, or even the greater part of the people, were inclined to these views. The Lollards might be known by their serious demeanour, their constant reference to "God's law." Both men and women were teachers and expounders; they explained the Scriptures, which they had translated into the English tongue, and they denounced the Mendicants, who thus became hateful to the people.[1] Profoundly disgusted as men were with the luxury, negligence, and worldliness of the Church, the new opinions had much to recommend them; and just about the time that they were taking root in England the mundane and unchristian character of Pope and bishops received a striking and remarkable illustration.

4. The quarrel of the Pope and Antipope had now come to a question of actual warfare, and Urban, whose chief hope lay in England, had endeavoured to institute a "crusade" in his favour. This was actually taken up by Bishop Spencer of Norwich, a martial prelate who had distinguished himself in the late insurrection. Spencer was the Pope's agent in England, and being supported by the Archbishop of Canterbury, he preached a "crusade" with great success. The crusading fervour had indeed long departed; but the hatred of the English for the French counted for a good deal, and some enthusiasm might probably be excited by the very ample absolution and indulgence which the Pope was willing to bestow on his warriors. This ran as follows:—"By the authority of the Apostolic See committed to me in this matter, I absolve you from all your sins which you have confessed and expressed contrition for, and from all those which you would be willing to confess if you could remember them; and I grant you a plenary remission of sins, and promise you the retribution of the just and the gift of eternal salvation, and all the

[1] Knighton, *De Event. Ang. Col.*, 2661-2665.

privileges given to those who go to the Holy Land; and I give to you a share in the prayers and good deeds of the universal Church."[1] It was debated in Parliament whether the matter should be allowed to proceed, and agreed, after much opposition, that the bishop should be left free to act, and that the fifteenth granted in a previous Parliament to the King for carrying on the French war should be conceded to him. Thus fortified, Bishop Spencer went on with vigour, engaging skilful captains and attracting to his standard many of the common people. There could hardly be a more complete illustration of the gross ignorance of religion which prevailed than the fact that so many were found to believe that, by taking a share in this marauding expedition, they were really acting for their souls' health. But doubtless many were under this delusion, while others joined the bishop's standard simply from the hope of plunder and the love of fighting. The whole affair seemed to all the wiser heads so preposterous, that at the last moment the King, rash youth though he was, was persuaded to forbid it; but the bishop, who was more the Pope's man than the King's, set sail in spite of this check. He arrived at Calais, and "unfurling the banner of the Cross," proceeded to make a treacherous attack on Gravelines, which was captured, and the whole of the inhabitants indiscriminately massacred. This butchery of unoffending people is recorded by the historian, who can find no words bad enough for Wycliffe, as a most righteous act favoured by heaven.[2] Similar scenes were enacted at Dunkirk, and the success of the "crusaders" in their bloody work was so great that numbers flocked from England to join the army. A sort of madness seized the people, especially the "religious" of all orders, who, with or without permission, flocked away to the army. The natural result soon followed. The crowd of useless, inexperienced, ill-armed fanatics, who could neither be led nor fed, were involved in the extremes of misery. The army was checked before Ypres, which could not be taken. The

[1] Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 79.

[2] "Percurrentes villam nulli parcunt, sed eos usque ad unum delere laborant, sicque crucis beneficio factum quod unus ex eis non remansit." —*Hist. Ang.*. ii. 89.

King of France was advancing to protect his subjects. The English crusaders were compelled to capitulate. The marauding bishop obtained terms far more easy than he had any right to expect, and with the miserable relics of his army returned to England.[1]

5. So foolish, unjustifiable, and resultless an expedition, made in the name of religion and the cause of the Church, must needs have had an effect in advancing the Lollard movement. Wycliffe wrote strongly against it, blaming the Pope for bringing "the seal or banner of Christ on the cross, that is token of peace, mercy, and charity, for to slay all Christian men, for love of two false priests that be open antichrist, for to maintain their worldly state, to oppress Christendom worse than Jews were against Holy Writ and life of Christ and His Apostles," and asking, "Why will not the proud Priest of Rome grant full pardon to all men for to live in peace and charity and patience, as he does to all men to fight and slay Christian men?"[2]

6. There is no movement against the Lollards recorded till the Parliament of 1388, when, according to Knighton, the whole Parliament, seeing the ship of the Church to be tossed in dangerous waves, made petition to the King to apply a remedy, lest the ark of the faith should be irremediably shattered. The King, in reply, gave command to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the other bishops that they should exercise their office more diligently in their several dioceses according to the canonical laws, punish the delinquents, and examine carefully their English books. He also directed his letters patent to be sent into all the counties authorising the imprisonment of heretics, and that special inquisitors should be appointed to examine their books; but, says the chronicler, "there was a very tardy and almost null performance of these things, for the hour of correction had not yet come."[3]

7. The next year we find the archbishop, who was conducting a metropolitical visitation, engaged at Leicester in trying certain Lollards. Information was laid before him against eight persons that they held—(1) That in the sacra-

[1] Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 103.

[2] Lewis, *Life of Wycliffe*, p. 121. [3] Knighton, *Col.*, 2708.

ment of the altar there remained, after consecration, material bread, together with the body of Christ;[1] (2) that tithes ought not to be paid to one in mortal sin; (3) that images ought not in any way to be worshipped; (4) that the Cross ought not to be worshipped; (5) that mass and matins ought not to be monotoned; (6) that clergy when in sin cannot administer the sacraments; (7) that no Pope can excommunicate unless a man be first excommunicated of God; (8) that no prelate can give indulgences; (9) that a layman may preach; (10) that it is wrong to give to Mendicants; (11) that confession to a priest is not necessary.[2] The persons accused of holding these opinions, being summoned before the archbishop, refused to come, and were excommunicated. Warrant was then given to the mayor and sheriffs to arrest them;[3] but this does not appear to have been done. There is, however, a record of three persons, whether making part of the eight inculpated or not does not appear—viz. William Smith, Roger and Alice Dexter —appearing before the archbishop and desiring to be released from excommunication. The penance assigned to these persons was vexatious and degrading. They were to appear at the procession of the clergy of the collegiate church, William and Roger clad in shirts and trousers, Alice in a chemise only, all with bare feet and heads. William was to carry in one hand an image of St. Catherine, Roger and Alice crucifixes, and each of them in the other hand a taper of half-a-pound weight. They were to adore their images three times during the procession, and then, entering the church, to stand before the crucifix while mass was sung, and after the mass to make offerings to the celebrant. On the following Saturday they were to appear in the public market in the same guise, and three times to adore the images by genuflections and kissing. On the Sunday, in their parish church, they were to go through the same forms; but on account of the great cold they were allowed, in the church, to have on them some of their clothes, only the feet and head must be bare.[4]

[1] The opinions of the Lollards on the Eucharist seem to have been nearly equivalent to what we know as Consubstantiation.

[2] Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 208. [3] *Ib.*, iii. 210. [4] *Ib.*, iii. 211.

8. It was calculated, no doubt, by this sort of vexatious publicity, and the shame attendant upon it, to strike terror into the people. But the effect does not seem to have been answerable to the expectations. Walsingham comments (1389) on the vast and rapid increase of the Lollards, and asserts that they had begun the practice of ordaining, asserting that every priest had the full power of transmitting orders.[1] They also declaimed against pilgrimages and the idolatrous reverence for images. The bishops, he says, saw and knew these things, but were utterly careless about them, leaving their sheep to the wolves, and none of them, save only the bishop of Norwich, venturing to take severe measures.[2]

9. In 1392 Henry Crumpe was brought before the Convocation sitting at Oxford. Crumpe was a Cistercian monk, by nation an Irishman, and had before been in trouble in Ireland under the bishop of Meath. The matters on which he was accused were of the most trivial description, being some assertions as to confession being better made to the parish priest than to the friar.[3] That Crumpe should have been arraigned and censured for such teaching, clearly shows that the friars were now trembling for their existence, and that under the attacks of the Lollards their influence was collapsing. The numerous English satirical poems which came forth about this period, all have for the main object of their satire the Mendicants, their begging, cheating, and hypocrisy.[4] The friars were therefore prompted by the principles of self-preservation to denounce and attack the Lollards, and the struggle between them was an internecine one. It was clear that both could

[1] This came naturally from the opinion generally held by the Lollards, that the difference between bishop and priest was only one of jurisdiction and governance, not of office.—See *Apology for Lollards*, pp. 28, 29.

[2] Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 188.

[3] *Fascic. Zizan.*, pp. 343-359.

[4] See the volumes of songs edited by Mr. Wright (Rolls Series, and Camden Soc.), especially the poems known as "Piers Plowman's Crede," "The Complaint of the Plowman," "The Song against the Friars," "Jack Upland," and, of better known poems, Robert Langland's "Vision of Piers Plowman," and Chaucer's "Pardoner's Tale."

not exist together as popular organisations. The bishops, however, to whom the friars were not very acceptable, were perhaps not inclined to be moved at every complaint made by them against a Lollard, and thus the processes were few, and side by side with them were occasionally to be found processes taken against the friars themselves.[1]

10. But the principal reason which prevented the bishops taking active measures against the Lollards was the political insecurity of the time, and the difficulties in which they were placed by the contest between the two rival popes. The Pope recognised in England was eager to gain, as a help for his struggle, those rich spoils arising from English benefices which his predecessors had formerly enjoyed. The Statutes of Provisors of 1351 and 1362 had been administered but slackly, and often set aside to suit the royal convenience. It seemed necessary now to renew the law, and to make it more stringent. This was accomplished in the Parliament of 1390. Another Provisors' Statute was thus placed on the statute-book, destined indeed, like its predecessors, to be grievously infringed upon by the irrepressible covetousness of the Roman bishop, but testifying valuably to the continuance of that national protest which at length made itself effectually heard.[2] The two archbishops thought it necessary to protest against this Act as opposed to the liberties of Holy Church and their duty to the Pope;[3] but doubtless the clergy generally, and the nation at large, received it thankfully.

11. The re-enactment of the Provisors' law was soon followed by the re-enactment of the more general and more important law of *Præmunire*. This was intended "to pre-

[1] Thus Brantingham, bishop of Exeter, published an ordinance bidding the archdeacons of his diocese not to allow friars to hear confessions.—Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 147.

[2] 13 Ric. II., st. 2. By this Act forfeiture and banishment were decreed against future transgressors.

[3] "Nolumus nec intendimus alicui statuto in præsenti Parliamento nunc noviter edito, nec antiquo prætenso innovato, quatenus statuta hujusmodi, seu eorum aliquod, in restrictionem potestatis apostolicæ aut in subversionem, enervationem, seu derogationem ecclesiasticæ libertatis tendere dignoscuntur, quomodolibet consentire."

vent encroachments on and usurpations of jurisdiction, as the other was framed for the defence of patronage."[1] The first statute of *Præmunire* (so called from the first word in the sheriff's writ) condemns to outlawry, forfeiture, and imprisonment all persons who should venture to avail themselves of the aid of foreign courts. The passing of this Act, or ordinance, was somewhat irregular, but an Act in 1365 brought all suitors in papal courts under its provisions. The Act of 1393 was of a stronger character, "one of the strongest defensive measures taken during the Middle Ages against Rome." The Pope had grievously interfered with the rights and privileges of the English Church, denying the jurisdiction of the King's courts, and translating bishops even against their will. Even the most papal bishops had been constrained to admit that such infringements of the royal prerogative ought not to be endured;[2] and with the general consent of all estates of the realm the most trenchant and valuable anti-papal statute, enacted previously to the work of the Reformation Parliament, was now made law.[3] This statute, as has been well said, "furnishes in ecclesiastical history the clue of the events that connect the Constitutions of Clarendon with the Reformation,"[4] and nothing done during all the history of the Middle Ages more distinctly proclaims and emphasises the nationality of the English Church.

12. But if the attention of the bishops was called off from the Lollards for the moment by important political matters, it was soon forcibly drawn to them again by the extreme boldness with which their views were pushed into notice in 1394. In that year, the King being absent in Ireland, and a Parliament being held under the Duke of York, the Lollards, who had many friends in the Commons' House, brought in there a bill, which set forth under twelve heads their principal tenets. As this constitutes an authentic declaration of their views, it deserves to be considered in detail. The "Conclusions" were as follow:—
I. That from the moment that the Church of England

[1] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii. 330; Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 208.
[2] See Courtney's Protest. Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops*, iii. 386.
[3] 16 Ric. II., c. 5, Statutes, ii. 84. [4] Stubbs, *u. s.*

accepted endowments, faith, hope, and charity began to disappear, and pride and mortal sins to prevail. II. That the office of priesthood, as conferred by the ritual used by the Church, is not a true priesthood, but a sham. III. That the vow of chastity enforced on the priesthood leads to divers abominable sins. IV. "That the pretended miracle of the sacrament of bread leads all men, save a few, into idolatry; because they think that the body of Christ, which never is out of heaven, can by virtue of the words of a priest be essentially included in a little bit of bread which they show to the people." V. That exorcisms and blessings of wine, bread, water, oil, salt, etc., the walls of the church, vestments, chalices, mitres, etc., are practices of necromancy rather than of sacred theology. VI. That the holding of temporal offices by prelates and clergy is altogether opposed to right principle. VII. That special prayers for particular dead persons, who are named, is a preferring of one before the other, and a false foundation for almsgiving; and thus all the eleemosynary houses in England are on a wrong foundation. VIII. That pilgrimages, prayers, and offerings made to crosses and images are very near to idolatry, and that of all images that of the Trinity is most to be condemned. IX. That auricular confession and the pretended power of absolution exalt the pride of priests and produce many evil consequences. X. That homicide in war or "by the pretended law of justice" for temporal causes, without any spiritual revelation, is expressly contrary to the New Testament. XI. That vows of chastity taken by women lead to horrible sins. XII. That the multitude of unnecessary arts practised in the kingdom nourishes and produces much evil and sin. "We present to you these Conclusions, which are more fully explained in books in the English tongue, which we desire the people to read, and we pray you to lend your aid to the reform of the Church." [1]

13. This bold appeal to Parliament by the Lollards was not only presented in the Parliament House, but, effectually to ensure its publication, it was fastened upon the doors of St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey. The

[1] *Fascic. Zizan.*, pp. 360-369; Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 221, *sq.*

Lollards seemed to invite and court the strife, and as some of their conclusions (such as those touching war and capital punishment) were entirely opposed to the temporal government, it was manifest that they could not be left unnoticed. The king, therefore, on his return from Ireland, called together some of the chief supporters of the Lollards, and threatened them with the most terrible consequences if they ventured to persevere in supporting such views. These menaces had the effect of stopping for a time the rapid progress of these revolutionary opinions.[1] The death of Archbishop Courtney, which followed in the next year (1396), may have again encouraged them, for soon afterwards the Pope despatched letters to the English King, requesting him to aid the bishops in their attempts to repress this growing heresy.[2] The new Primate, Archbishop Arundel, translated from York (1397), was as ready to use severe measures as his predecessor, perhaps even more so. But the great political convulsions which attended the latter years of the reign of Richard II. stood in the way. The King procured the banishment of Archbishop Arundel by the Parliament. He betook himself to the Pope. The Pope, desiring neither to offend the King nor entirely to desert the archbishop, made a translation of Arundel to St. Andrews in Scotland, and then, the See of Canterbury being considered vacant, "provided for it" by a Bull, which appointed Roger Walden, the King's treasurer, to the post. The effect of this was to create a firm union between Archbishop Arundel and Henry Bolingbroke, who was also in exile—a union which quickly culminated in the triumphant return of Bolingbroke, the abdication of Richard, and the restoration of the Primate to all his rank and privileges. No notice was taken of the pseudo-primate Walden, nor was any resignation required of him. He was simply treated as never having legally occupied the post.

14. One of the conditions upon which the new king, Henry IV., had obtained the valuable aid of Arundel was a promise to enable him to act vigorously against the Lollards. It was held that nothing less than capital

[1] Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 217; *Annal. Ric. II. Regis*, p. 183.
[2] *Annal. Ricardi II.*, p. 187.

punishment would suffice to stop the rapid progress of the sect, and a new law was therefore required to enable the secular arm readily to support the bishops' censures. In January 1401 a Convocation was summoned and presided over by Archbishop Arundel. The Primate dwelt upon the dangerous opinions of the Lollards, and the need of some sharp legislation to repress them. The dignified clergy, who felt that their estates as well as their faith were at stake, through the revolutionary doctrines which were abroad, readily assented to these views. They drew up a petition of a fierce and determined character, calling upon the Government to take proceedings against heretics, and stating that if they refused to recant, or after recanting relapsed to their old errors, the civil officers should do "what further is incumbent upon them in this matter." The petition was at once granted by the King, with the assent of the Lords, and the Commons at the same time petitioning to the same effect, a statute was enacted and enrolled, which provided that those who were certified heretics by the bishops, if they refused to recant, or if they relapsed, should "be caused to be burnt in some conspicuous place."[1] Thus, for the first time in English history, the Statute law of the land formally took upon itself the odious task of being the executioner of those ecclesiastically condemned.

15. While Parliament was still sitting, probably before the new statute had been actually passed, proceedings were taken against William Sawtry, rector of St. Osith (St. Bennet Shere-hog), London. He was brought before the Convocation on February 12 (1401), and charged, that having held and taught certain false doctrines in the diocese of Norwich, he had, upon being brought before the bishop of that see, abjured such doctrines, but that since then in the diocese of London he had again held and taught the same doctrines. The doctrines objected against him were—(1.) That it was not lawful to adore the cross, but only Christ who hung upon the cross. (2.) That he would rather adore a temporal king than a wooden cross. (3.) That he would rather honour holy men than even the

[1] 2 Henry IV., c. 16; Wilkins, iii. 252; *Annal. Henrici IV.*, p. 335.

actual cross upon which Christ suffered. (4.) That he would rather honour a man truly penitent than the material cross.[1] (5.) That a man predestined to glory is to be honoured above an angel. (6.) That if one has vowed a pilgrimage, he is not bound to perform his vow, but had better expend the money it would cost him upon the poor. (7.) That priests and deacons are more bound to preach than to say the canonical hours.[2] (8.) That after consecration in the Eucharist there remains bread of the same nature as before. Sawtry denied having taught these things, and then recanted them. He also desired that a copy of the articles might be given him, that he might make explanation. This was granted. In his defence he practically admits that he had taught as articled. He declared that the gross material cross was not a thing to be adored because of peril of idolatry; that good men are above angels because they are of the same nature as Christ. Being questioned on the sacrament of the altar, he hesitated. He was pressed as to his belief whether there remained bread after consecration. He answered that he did not know. Being at length induced to declare his belief, he said that bread was there as before consecration. Asked if he would stand by determination of Holy Church, said he was willing to do so "if it were not contrary to the Divine will." Pronounced to be heretical. His former condemnation before the bishop of Norwich proved. This was on February 19. On February 24 he was again before the Convocation, and was formally degraded. On February 26 the royal writ for his execution was issued, and he was burned at Smithfield, suffering, it is said, with great

[1] "Therefore, if ye will verily worship the image of God, we open to you this that is veray, that ye do well to a man that is made the image of God, and give him honour and reverence; give meat to the hungry, clothes to the naked, ministering to the sick, harbour to the stranger, necessaries to the prisoner."—*Apology for Lollards*, p. 89.

[2] "One thing I wot well, that if priests are bound to their Hours by the law that themselves have made, they ought to be bound by the charge that Christ hath given them. And if they have strait conscience to fail in this that themselves have bound them to, they should have mickle more to fail in this that Christ hath bound them to."—*Apology*, p. 45.

constancy. He was the first person burned in England for heresy.[1]

16. Before the same Convocation John Purveye or Purneye, who had been Wycliffe's amanuensis and helper, and who had been previously tried for heresy, made a full recantation and retractation of his views on all the chief points of the Lollard teaching. He acknowledged his belief that in the Eucharist after consecration there remained not the substance of bread and wine; that auricular confession was salutary; that holy orders were necessary; that civil ministers have the true power of the keys; that no priest has a right to preach until sent by the bishop; that persons should be compelled to keep religious vows which they have taken; that the decisions of the Council of Lyons are to be accepted. In all these things he desired to submit himself to Holy Church, and to withdraw all private opinions.[2] The recantation of Purveye was received and accepted, and the archbishop even promoted him afterwards to a benefice, where he does not seem to have borne a very good character.[3] It is perhaps a little to his credit, as seeming to show that his earnestness was not quite gone, that he was again in trouble under Archbishop Chichele in 1421, and is thought to have died in prison.[4]

17. The archbishop had now provided himself with a sharp and effective weapon for contending against Lollard opinions, but he seems to have shrunk from using it in a way to satisfy the more violent of the Church party. In 1406 a strong petition was addressed to the King by Parliament for increased strictness against the Lollards, and a new statute was founded on it. This does not, however, appear to have been carried out,[5] and the archbishop was left to those powers which he already possessed. Under these we find him employed in 1407 in conducting the

[1] Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 252, *sq.*; *Fascic. Zizan.*, 408-411, where the wrong date is given in the side note. [2] *Fascic. Zizan.*, 383-407.

[3] "I gave him," says Arundel, "a benefice a mile out of this castle, and I heard more complaints about his covetousness for tithes than I did of all men that were advanced in my diocese."—*Thorpe's Exam.*, Wordsworth, *Eccl. Biog.*, i. 278. [4] Lewis's *Wyckliffe*, p. 270.

[5] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii. 359.

trial of William Thorpe. Thorpe's own account of his trial remains to us, and though doubtless it cannot be relied upon as altogether exact, having been written down afterwards from memory, yet, for the most part, it is probably to be trusted. The archbishop is represented in the account as very rough and rude, but as displaying considerable patience, and discussing at length with Thorpe all the points on which information had been laid against him by the men of Shrewsbury, where he had preached. Thorpe was peremptorily called upon to submit himself unreservedly to the Church, but this he refused to do, and was committed to prison, where he probably remained during his life, as there is no record that he was burned.[1]

18. The archbishop, in his examination of Thorpe, seems to have discovered that something was needed to supplement the statute which he had obtained against heretics. The statute merely provided an extreme remedy. It did not supply any preventive or cautionary provisions which it was thought might be salutary. With a view, therefore, to remedy this, at a Convocation held at Oxford, October 1409, the Primate published certain Constitutions, designed, as he expressly says, "to strengthen the common law made in his behalf."[2] (1, 2, 3.) The first, second and third of these forbid any ordained person to preach without the express license of the ordinary, and enjoin preachers to confine themselves to certain topics, and not to presume to contradict any doctrine sanctioned by Holy Church. (4.) The fourth forbids schoolmasters to teach their scholars anything as to the sacraments, or on theological topics. (5.) The fifth forbids any to read a treatise of John Wycliffe, unless it has been formally approved by the proper authority. (6.) The sixth condemns the translating of the Scriptures, and forbids any to read Wycliffe's translation. (7.) Ordains that doctrines of the catholic faith be not called in question by way of scholastic disputation. (8.) That the old ceremonial sanctioned by the Church be respected. (9.) That no priest be admitted to celebrate without letters commendatory. (10.) "Considering and

[1] See Wordsworth's *Eccl. Biog.*, i. 261, *sq.*

[2] Johnson, *Eng. Canons*, ii. 409.

lamenting how our fair University of Oxford, which, like a thriving vine, used to spread her branches, to the honour of God and the advancement and protection of His Church, is in part degenerated, and brings forth sour grapes by eating whereof many of her sons, being too well conceited of their knowledge in the law of God, have set their teeth on edge, and our province is infected with new unprofitable doctrines, and blemished with the new damnable brand of Lollardy, to the great scandal of the University itself, reaching to remote foreign parts, and to the exceeding regret of those who study there: " We therefore enjoin all heads and governors of colleges and halls to make, every month, a strict inquiry into the opinions of those under them, and if any be found holding these false opinions, he shall be censured, and if he amend not, be expelled. But if the wardens and governors be themselves infected, then they shall be strictly inquired after and censured by the ordinary.[1]

19. While the archbishop was carefully building up the ecclesiastical edifice, and striving to establish an effectual discipline, the whole temporal status of the Church was subjected to a series of most dangerous attacks. In the Parliament held at Coventry in 1404,[2] the proposition was boldly made by the Commons, that inasmuch as their funds were greatly exhausted by their contributions in the war, and inasmuch as the clergy had done but little, the king should take the whole of the clerical estates into his hands for a year. The archbishop vigorously opposed these suggestions of the knights. He pointed out that the alien priories which the king had lately seized, had, through the cupidity of the knights, failed to aid his revenue. Another bishop (Rochester) declared that the knights had incurred excommunication by proposing to abrogate Magna Charta.[3] The representatives of the Commons were for the moment silenced, but they speedily returned to the attack. In the Parliament of 1410 the Commons sent a petition to the Crown in which a systematic scheme for plundering the Church is put forward.

[1] Johnson, *Eng. Canons*, ii. 457, 473.

[2] Known as the *Parliamentum indoctum*, because the sheriffs were directed to return no lawyers.

[3] *Ann. Hen., IV.* p. 393.

This, according to Walsingham, ran as follows:—"To the most excellent Lord King and all the nobles in the present Parliament assembled, all the faithful Commons humbly represent and truly affirm that our Lord the King can have from the temporal goods held by bishops, abbots, and priors, and proudly wasted in the kingdom, sufficient to support 1500 knights, 6200 men-at-arms, and a hundred hospitals, more than now there are, well and faithfully sustained from the lands and tenements now uselessly and proudly wasted." [1] In addition to this hostile demonstration against Church revenues, which the king was not inclined in any way to encourage, the Commons made several attempts to modify the Statute *De Hæreticis comburendis*. They desired that clergy convicted under the statute might not be imprisoned in the bishops' prisons, but in the secular prisons, and that it should not be competent to arrest persons suspected of heresy without the king's writ.[2] In neither of these points, however, did they obtain their object. The king was resolutely set to uphold the Church, and to give every facility to the bishops for the suppression of heresy.

20. The reply to the attempts made to support the Lollards in Parliament was the burning of Thomas Badby, a poor tailor in Smithfield,[3] for a want of theological exactness in his views on the sacrament of the altar, and the archbishop was soon engaged with a more illustrious adversary. John Oldcastle, a member of a knightly family in Wales, had married the granddaughter and heiress of that old Lord Cobham who had shown himself in Richard's Parliaments on the side of the views of Wycliffe. Probably his granddaughter shared his views, and Sir John Oldcastle (her third husband) certainly soon made himself conspicuous by advocating and upholding them. Connected

[1] Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 280. In Fabyan's *Chronicle* (p. 575) the calculation is somewhat different, and more elaborately worked out. The value of the Church lands is put at 322,000 marks per annum. Out of this the king was to receive £20,000, 15 earls 3000 marks each, 1500 knights 100 marks each, 100 hospitals 100 marks each, 6200 squires and 15,000 priests 7 marks each.

[2] Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 283. [3] Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 326.

as he was by marriage with the De la Poles and Courtneys, and having the control of large estates, distinguished also for his skill in war,[1] Sir John Oldcastle was a very dangerous patron of the Lollard views. The archbishop saw plainly that it was not safe to neglect him, and the young king was aroused to a suspicious watchfulness by the placard fastened in bravado on the doors of the London churches, which declared that the Lollards had 100,000 men ready to rise to assert their rights.[2] In the Convocation of 1413 the archbishop was required by the clergy to proceed against Oldcastle on the ground that he had encouraged unlicensed preachers to preach contrary to the archbishop's Constitutions, and had upheld them by force of arms; and that his views on the sacrament of the altar, on penance, on pilgrimages, on the worship of images, and on the power of the keys, were different from those which the Roman Church held. Upon this representation it was determined to proceed against the knight, but as he was in the service of the king it was thought necessary to refer to him. The king desired that the matter might be a little delayed, and that he would himself speak with Oldcastle. Having done this, he was constrained after some time to report to the archbishop that he could in no way convince him.[3] A citation was therefore issued to Oldcastle to appear before the Convocation at St. Paul's. He was in his castle at Cowling near Rochester, and the citation could not be served upon him. He however trusted himself to go to court, thinking that the king, if he would not receive his confession, would at least protect him. In this he was

[1] He had been a leader of the expeditionary force of 1200 troops sent into France to aid the Duke of Burgundy. Walsingham calls him "fortis viribus, operi martio satis idoneus."

[2] Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 291. For the process against Old castle we have the archbishop's own letter in *Fascic. Zizan.*, the careful account of Walsingham, and the account in the Archbishop's Register, Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 353.

[3] Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 292. It is said that on the day when Oldcastle appeared before the king at Kennington a great burning of Wycliffe's books was taking place, and one was found containing several tracts which Oldcastle owned to be his property.—Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 357.

deceived. The king ordered him to be arrested and conveyed to the Tower, and on the day appointed by the archbishop, to appear before the Convocation. Upon being brought before the bishops, he tendered a written paper containing his confession. In this he declares as follows:— "That it is his desire to believe faithfully as Holy Church teaches, but that he desires to declare his belief on four points—(1.) That the most worshipful sacrament of the altar is Christ's body in form of bread, the same body that was born of the blessed Virgin our Lady Saint Mary, done on the cross, dead and buried, the third day rose from death to life, the which body is now glorified in heaven. (2.) Also, as for the sacrament of penance, I believe that it is needful to every man that shall be saved to forsake sin, and to do penance for sin before done, with true confession, very contrition, and due satisfaction, as God's law limiteth and teacheth, or else may he not be saved. (3.) Images are not of belief, but are calendars to laymen to represent and bring to mind the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, and martyrdom and good living of saints. And that whoso doth the worship to dead images that is due to God, or putteth faith, hope, or trust in help of them as he should do to God, or hath affection to one more than another, he doth in that the great sin of mammetry.[1] (4.) He that knows the holy commandments of God and keepeth them to his end, he shall be saved, though he never in his life go on pilgrimage as men use now, to Canterbury or Rome or any other place." These statements having been considered by the archbishop, were held not to be sufficient. Oldcastle was asked the crucial question which sent so many poor men to the stake, whether he believed that after consecration in the Eucharist there remained material bread or not. Also, whether, when a priest might be had, it was *necessary* that confession of sins should be made to him. He declined to answer beyond what his written statement had put forth; he declared himself desirous to believe as Holy Church taught, but expressed a doubt whether the Pope, cardinals, and bishops, had the power of determining such things.

[1] Idolatry, mammet = an image.

The archbishop then gave him for his consideration what he declared was the judgment of Holy Church in the matter, written in English. "The faith and the determination of the Church touching the blessed sacrament of the altar is this—that after the sacramental words be said by a priest in his mass, the material bread that was before is turned into Christ's very body, and so there leaveth on the altar no material bread, nor material wine, the which were there before the saying of the sacramental words. Holy Church hath ordained that every Christian man, living here bodily on earth, ought to be shriven to a priest ordered by the Church if he may come to him. Christ ordained St. Peter His apostle to be His vicar here on earth, whose See is the Church of Rome, ordaining and granting the same power which He gave to Peter should succeed to all Peter's successors, the which we call now Popes of Rome. By whose power, in churches particular, special be ordained prelates as archbishops, bishops, curates, and other degrees, to whom Christian men ought to obey after the laws of the Church of Rome. This is the determination of Holy Church. Holy Church hath determined that it is needful to a Christian man to go a pilgrimage to holy places, and there specially to worship holy relics of saints, apostles, martyrs, confessors, and all saints approved by the Church of Rome." Oldcastle was required to give his opinions on these articles. When brought before the archbishop and his assessors for this purpose he first of all declined to accept the absolution which they offered him from the excommunication which he had incurred. As regards the articles, he said that in the Eucharist there was the true body of Christ, and also true bread. As to confession, it might be good and useful to confess to a priest, but it was not necessary. As to worshipping images, he held that it was only Christ who hung upon the cross, and not the material cross which was to be adored. As to the Pope's power, he said that the Pope was the head of Antichrist, and archbishops and bishops were his tail; that no reverence was due to them save in proportion as they were the true imitators of Christ and Peter. He warned the bystanders against the seductions of false priests, and refused

to give any other answer. The archbishop then pronounced formal sentence against him as a heretic, and left him to the secular arm.[1] Arundel, who no doubt honestly desired to bring this leading man to recant, obtained a respite for him of forty days from the king. Oldcastle was confined in the Tower, but he contrived to escape, and to rally round him some bands of Lollards, who seem to have entertained the project of dethroning the king. The rapid and vigorous measures taken by King Henry frustrated this design, and then followed a series of executions, both of priests and laymen, who were hanged and burned as traitors and heretics.[2]

21. The rebellious movements of the Lollards, real or supposed, brought upon them another statute of greater strictness. This ordains that all king's officers, of what grade soever, are to aid the bishops in their search for heretics, and to apprehend them, and they themselves are to make inquisition for them, and arrest them, delivering them to the ordinaries within ten days[3] (1414). This severe Act was perhaps compensated for in the opinion of some by the death of their great enemy, Archbishop Arundel, whose somewhat strange end, from a swelling of the tongue and throat, was held by the Lollards to be an appropriate judgment for having silenced so many of their voices.[4] But his successor Archbishop Chichele did not show himself in any way more favourable to the new opinions. Numerous cases of trials and punishments are to be found recorded during the next twenty years.

22. Of some of these victims no very definite records remain, but as to others particulars may be gleaned. John Claydon, burned in 1415, was a tanner or skin-dresser in London. He was accused of heresy, and, probably showing himself obstinate, was given over to the secular arm and burned.[5] Against William Taylor, a priest of Oxford, we have the process remaining, and find that the principal

[1] *Fascic. Zizan.*, 433-450. Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 291-296.

[2] Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.*, ii. 299. The number of executions was thirty-eight.—Stubbs, iii. 364, note. [3] Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 356.

[4] The orthodox Gascoigne calls this a direct judgment of God on him.—Rogers's *Gascoigne*, p. 35. [5] Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 371-375.

errors attributed to him were, "that prayer was to be directed to God alone;" "that clerks ought not to be lords nor holders of estates." He denied the divine right of kings, condemned religious mendicancy, the worship of the cross and the saints, refused to accept the decisions of the Council of Constance. Being unwilling to retract, he was burned at Smithfield, March 22, 1422.[1] Robert Hoke, a priest of Braybrooke in the diocese of Lincoln, suffered in 1425. His confession is printed in Wilkins, by which it appears that his chief offences were not having done worship to the cross on Good Friday, and having in his possession books and "treties" containing "many foul and horrible errors and heresies."[2] It is probable that after confession Hoke relapsed; hence his fate. In 1428 was burned at Norwich William Whyte, a priest, of the process against whom we have copious details. His case was in many ways remarkable. He was condemned by a diocesan synod at Norwich, not by the provincial synod of Canterbury. He had indeed been previously tried before the archbishop, and had abjured the opinions with which he was charged, so that he was now treated as a relapsed person. He appears to have held the doctrine of Consubstantiation. As to the other points in which he was declared to be in error, the chief were, "the unlawfulness of Churchmen possessing property;" "the condemnation of the mendicant orders;" the "denial of the necessity of auricular confession and priestly absolution;" the assertion "that all good men have priestly powers;" that "a good layman might consecrate the Eucharist;" that "after consecration bread still remained in the Eucharist;" that priests might marry, and that he himself was married; that the clergy had fallen into grievous corruption through prohibition of matrimony; that extreme unction and fasting at stated seasons were unnecessary; that it was lawful to work on holidays; that the clergy had no claim for tithes; that clergy might preach without license; that relics and images were not to be adored; that church property might be taken by laymen; that capital punishment for theft and that war were unlawful.[3]

[1] *Fascic. Zizan.*, p. 412. [2] Wilkins, iii. 437.
[3] *Fascic. Zizan.*, pp. 417-432.

At the same time that Whyte suffered, Abraham of Colchester and John Wadden are said to have been also burned.[1] In 1431 Thomas Bagley, a priest, vicar of Maunden in Essex, was burned in Smithfield. He is accused of having taught that "the consecrated host is true bread in its nature and the body of Christ in figure;" and of having boldly protested before the Convocation, "I do not believe, and I will not believe, that the priest, by virtue of the sacramental words, makes Christ or God."[2] These were some of the more conspicuous victims.[3] But the most remarkable of all was Sir John Oldcastle, who, after four years of liberty, was again captured in Wales, and having now the charge of treason against him as well as that of heresy, was brought up for judgment.[4] The punishments for both these offences were combined in his execution (1417). He was hanged as for treason, and burned as for heresy. A formal recantation of his heretical errors has been sometimes attributed to him. But the document which purports to contain this recantation is from internal evidence so manifestly a forgery, that it seems useless to quote it.[5] Besides those committed to the flames, there was a large number of Lollards sentenced to lighter but still most severe punishments. In 1428 the rector of Hegley was condemned to perpetual imprisonment, and William Harvey of Tenterden to the same punishment.[6] John Calle, a priest of London, and Ralph Mangym, priest, are also in the same year similarly sentenced.[7] Lollards were also before the Northern Convocation. Thomas Richmond, a friar minor of York, was in 1427 condemned of heresy at York,[8] but there does not appear to be any record of executions in the Northern Province.

[1] Foxe, i. 753. [2] Wilkins, iii. 515.

[3] There are other names mentioned as having suffered, *e.g.* Richard Turmyn (1415), Gregory, Richard Hunden, John Gardiner (1438), Richard Wych and his servant (1440), William Balowe (1466), John Goose (1473), an old man burned in Smithfield (1499).—Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii. 364, note; Foxe, i. 748-753.

[4] Capgrave, *De Illustribus Henricis*, p. 122.

[5] Printed in *Fascic. Zizan.*, p. 414.

[6] Wilkins, iii. 496. [7] *Ib.*, iii. 500. [8] *Ib.*, iii. 488.

23. There was much, doubtless, in the tenets of the Lollards which invited persecution, and which seemed to make some animadversion and restraint almost necessary to the very existence of the Church. They had adopted, and were prepared practically to carry out, some of the theoretical opinions of their master, Wycliffe, as to Church property and the disabilities of unworthy ministers. Many of them were clearly prepared to disparage orders altogether. They held that the virtuous layman was more competent to administer the sacraments than the evil-living priest—a specious doctrine, which nevertheless strikes at the very root of Church life. Such errors needed correction by authoritative statements and the exercise of discipline. But to treat them as the rulers of the Church in fact did, as soon as they had acquired the power to do so, was inexcusable. Having settled that error on the doctrine of the Eucharist was to be accounted heresy, though the subject does not belong to either of the accepted creeds, they then threw the expression of the Eucharistic doctrine into the baldest and most repulsive form, and made the acceptance or rejection of this a matter of life and death. If the Lollard could not say that he *believed* that after consecration there remained no longer bread and wine, if he could not say that accidents might exist without a subject, he was straightway burned. The strongest possible expressions of his belief in the real presence in the Eucharist, such as Oldcastle and others were quite ready to make, counted for nothing. He must accept the bald formula or perish, and all the time this formula—that bread and wine no longer remain save in their accidents—was entirely a modern dogma, and was not to be found in any of the Fathers. The persecution of the Lollards on this ground—the driving many through fear of death to accept doctrines which in their hearts they did not believe, the sacrificing of many others who were more true to their convictions—is a grievous blot upon the mediæval Church of England. The Church had no better way of dealing with poor ignorant men than to force them to accept a dogma practically useless, utterly repulsive to reason and the evidence of the senses, without any sanction in Scripture or primitive

antiquity, or to cause them to perish in the agonies of the flames.

24. The bishops were no doubt encouraged in their severe action against the Lollards by the proceedings of the Council of Constance. This great Council, which was held (1414) to heal if possible the schism in the Papacy (there were now three Popes), and to reform the Church in its head and members, distinguished itself by condemning the doctrines of Wycliffe in most express terms,[1] and in ordering the disinterment of his bones, as well as in burning John Huss, the great assertor of his views in Bohemia,[2] in spite of the distinct safe conduct given to him by the Emperor Sigismund. But whatever help this may have been to the dominant Churchmen, it is probable that the cause of Church authority lost more than it gained by the action of this Council, for it exposed pitilessly and in terrible detail the abuses of the Church and the vices and ignorance of the clergy, so that all the leading members of the Council concurred in denouncing them in terms as strong as could have been used by Wycliffe himself. And yet the matter ended with words. No action was taken to enforce reformation, and thus the Lollards as well as the bishops might find abundant justification in the proceedings of the Council.

[1] Forty-five errors of Wycliffe were condemned by the Council.—Labbe, *Concil.*, xii. 45.

[2] They had found their way into Bohemia through the support and approbation of Anne, the Bohemian princess, wife of Richard II., and by the agency of Peter Payne, otherwise Clerke, a Frenchman, born in England, who (according to Gascoigne) being a master of arts at Oxford, had stolen the seal of the University, under which he wrote to the people of Prague that all England had accepted the Wycliffe tenets, except the mendicants.—Rogers's *Gascoigne*, pp. 20, 186.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE REVOLT AGAINST MEDIÆVAL DOCTRINE: BISHOP PECOCK.

1447-1459.

1. Opponents of the Lollards. 2. Bishop Pecock's sermon. 3. Prevalence of angry feeling against the bishops. 4. Pecock's "Repressor of over-much Blaming of the Clergy." 5. His Treatise on Faith. 6. Condemned as heretical. 7. His recantation. 8. His harsh treatment afterwards. 9. John Bury's *Gladius Salomonis*.

1. So bold, thoroughgoing, and uncompromising an attack as that made by the Lollards on the system and status of the Church, naturally called forth numerous literary defenders of the ecclesiastical position. Not all Churchmen were contented, as Courtney, Arundel, and Chichele were, to respond to the objections of the Lollards by the simple expedient of burning them. The Friars had obtained, and in many cases had well deserved, a considerable literary reputation. They would not at once abandon their positions as untenable because a number of persons, many of whom were ignorant and untaught, violently inveighed against them. John Cunningham, a Carmelite friar, was a vigorous and able opponent of Wycliffe.[1] Thomas Netter of Walden, also a Carmelite, took a share in all the controversies of the period, and drew up, or at least completed, the collection of tracts bearing on the strife, known by the name of *Fasciculi Zizaniorum Magistri Jounnis Wycliffe cum Tritico*. William Wodeford, a brother of the Grey Friars, in Newgate, wrote against Wycliffe's doctrines.[2] But by far the most remarkable literary opponent of the Lollards,

[1] Some of his treatises are printed in the *Fascic. Zizan.*

[2] His treatise against Wycliffe's *Trialogus* is published in Brown's *Fascic. Rerum. Expetend.*

both from his treatise itself and from its consequences, was Reginald Pecock, bishop of St. Asaph.

2. In a sermon delivered at Paul's Cross in the year 1447, Bishop Pecock set forth seven propositions. (1.) A bishop is not necessarily bound to preach to the common people of his diocese. (2.) He ought rather to hold himself free from preaching, in order that he may attend to more important matters. (3.) A bishop ought to have greater knowledge in solving important questions than the inferior clergy are bound to have. (4.) Bishops are free to preach or not to preach, having regard to the more important functions they are called to perform, and which cannot be done by the lower clergy. (5.) A more useful work may be done to the souls of men than by preaching. (6.) Bishops may and ought to be non-resident in their dioceses when weighty causes call them away. (7.) It is not simoniacal for bishops to obtain their sees from the Pope by provision, nor to pay him annates and first-fruits.[1] The bishop expected that this bold line of defence would be received with applause by his brethren, and he boasted that no one hereafter would speak evil of the bishops nor murmur against them. But the bishops were not to be so easily set right in general estimation. The order was unpopular. Many were glad to get any handle of complaint against a bishop, and the prelates themselves were by no means pleased to have their defence based on such questionable ground. Many controversial antagonists at once appeared against Pecock,[2] and an appeal was made to Archbishop Stafford to censure the sermon. Pecock, in his defence before the archbishop, declared that he desired to clear the bishops from the calumnies with which they had been attacked both in the pulpit and out of it, and to bring their assailants to a better mind. His intentions being held to be good, he seems to have escaped easily; but he was a man of a temper that could not rest, and he quickly returned to the subject in a more elaborate form, from the consequences of which he did not escape so easily.

[1] Gascoigne, *Dict. Theol.* (ed. Rogers), p. 26, *sq.*

[2] Babington's *Introd. to Pecock's Repressor*, p. xviii.

3. As an acute and well-meaning man, Bishop Pecock could not but be painfully impressed with the intense feeling of dislike and suspicion with which the bishops and clergy were now everywhere regarded. It was not alone among the Lollards, or the "Bible-men" as they had come to be called, that this feeling prevailed. There was a school of more moderate reformers growing up in the Church, who were utterly shocked and scandalised by the miserable state of things which prevailed. These men had made their voices heard at Constance by the denunciations of Bishop Hallam, and of Gerson, the famous Chancellor of Paris. They were represented now in England by Thomas Gascoigne, the author of *The Dictionary of Theology*, who declares that the people openly murmured against the bishops in the streets, crying "Woe" against them for their wealth and pomp; that their negligence was bringing down divine judgments on the land. And that this popular hatred was not without good cause he shows by particular instances. Stafford, Archbishop of Canterbury, by birth a bastard, was Chancellor of England; Adam Moleyns, bishop of Chichester, was Keeper of the Privy Seal;[1] the bishop of Norwich, Walter Lyard, was the Queen's confessor, residing at Court; the bishop of Carlisle, and afterwards of Lincoln, was Treasurer of England; the bishop of Coventry, Buth, was Chancellor to Queen Margaret. John Kemp, Archbishop of York, scarcely entered his diocese for twenty-eight years during which he presided over it, and was twice Chancellor; and when the mob set upon Ayscough, bishop of Salisbury, to murder him, they upbraided him with having always lived with the king, and never resided in his diocese—therefore he should die. All these courtier-bishops were "provided" by the Pope, in spite of the Statutes of Provisors. The same authority "provided" George Nevil to the See of Exeter when he was but twenty-three years of age; and John Delabere to that of St. David's, where he signalised his episcopate by allowing his clergy to keep concubines at a tax of a noble a year.

[1] He was afterwards murdered (1450) at Portsmouth by the sailors, in revenge for the part he was supposed to have taken in the death of the Duke of Gloucester.

Gascoigne asserts, with a sweeping censure, that from the year 1403 there were none preferred in the Church who knew how in a due manner to do good to souls, or who could or would do it; that at that time in England the care of souls was destroyed by appropriations, the non-residence of curates and prelates, the promotion of worthless men, pluralities of benefices, and the very worst conferring of school degrees, and granting graces to the unworthy, wicked, and vicious persons in Oxford and other universities.[1] It must be confessed, therefore, that when Bishop Pecock undertook to defend the Church system of his day in an elaborate treatise, he showed at least remarkable boldness. He had to oppose the whole body of the Lollards, who held all secular employments of the clergy in utter detestation, and the large and increasing mass of moderate reforming sentiment which saw clearly that the abuses tolerated were bringing ruin upon the Church.

4. The task of defence was undertaken by Bishop Pecock in a work published in 1449, called "The Repressor of over much Blaming of the Clergy."[2] In this he undertakes to defend eleven practices or "governances" of the clergy, but he afterwards restricts himself to the defence of six, viz. the use of images—the going on pilgrimages—the holding of landed possessions by the clergy—the various ranks of the hierarchy—the making laws by papal and episcopal authority—the institutions of the religious orders.[3] All these were points specially assailed by the Lollards. Pecock begins his defence of the Church by saying that three especially erroneous opinions had to be overthrown before the matter could be rightly discussed. The first of these was, "that no ordinance is to be esteemed a law of God unless it be grounded on Scripture."[4] The

[1] Gascoigne, *Dict. Theol.* (ed. Rogers), pp. 16, 35, 37, 40, et p. l.

[2] Or rather "The Repressing of over miche wyting the Clergie."

[3] The five other points which he declares are defended in his other works are—(7.) The invocation of saints and priestly intercession. (8.) The costliness of ecclesiastical decorations. (9.) The ceremonies of the mass and the sacraments generally. (10.) The taking of oaths. (11.) The lawfulness of war and capital punishment.

[4] The Lollards had remarkably anticipated the Puritans of the six-

second, "That every humble Christian shall without fail arrive at a true sense of Scripture." The third, "That when the true sense of Scripture has been thus discovered, no arguments of clerks to the contrary should be listened to." Having devoted twenty chapters to the refutation of these opinions, in which it may be said that he often takes a very similar line to that which was taken in the next century by Richard Hooker in arguing against the Puritans of his day, the bishop proceeds in the second part to defend the special points of Church practice selected by him for defence. And, first, of Images and Pilgrimages. He meets very ably the Scripture argument against images, and declares that reason favours the use of images as memorials, and boldly asserts that no man commits idolatry with any image now in Christendom.[1] By ingeniously asserting that idolatry can only be committed by believing an image to be God, he thinks he gets over the difficulty raised by the fact that people worship certain images especially, and go pilgrimages to them, and believe that they see and move and hear. "No man," he says, "is by anything an idolater save he taketh and maketh a creature to be his God; but so doth no man though he trow that images have such virtue, and though he trow that images do miracles in such wise as creatures—the Apostles and other saints—did miracles, and though he trow that images be quick, or that they see or speak, or hear, or sweat at some whiles."[2] In the third part he defends the right of the clergy to be possessors of estates, and to exercise territorial rights. In this occurs one of the few allusions to Wycliffe. "Furthermore it is to wit that one clerk (but verily to say one heretic) tempereth the first opinion rehearsed before, and saith on this manner that if the clerk misuse habitually or customably his unmovable endowing, the clerk may lawfully and ought to be despoiled of that endowing by the temporal lords, and else not. But that this saying is unskilful may be showed thus. However habitually or customably I trespass against the king, what shall this hurt mine heir

teenth century. Pecock says, when they heard of any rule or direction, they were in the habit of saying, "Where groundest thou that in Holy Scripture?"—*Repressor*, p. 6. [1] *Repressor*, i. 148. [2] *Ib.*, i. 154.

which nothing trespasseth to the king, but is a full loving and true servant to the king? . . . If I be a bishop and misuse habitually mine unmovable possessions, and though an hundred of my predecessors have misused likewise, what right were this that an innocent, yea many innocents, coming after me, to whom these goods be owing as well as to me, and which should well use the same goods, should be deprived of the same goods?"[1] The fourth book defends the government of the Church by archbishops and bishops, and the making of ecclesiastical laws. In this occurs the curious mistake of arguing for the headship of St. Peter, because he is called Cephas, *i.e.* the head (κεφαλη.)[2] A more serious mistake is the advocating the papal error that the whole government of the Church by archbishops, bishops, etc., depends upon the divine commission given to Peter, and that these are merely the officers and deputies of the Pope. The fifth part undertakes to vindicate the religious orders. The bishop is not afraid to attempt the defence of that luxury and pomp by which the Mendicants in their buildings and surroundings had completely departed from the rule of their founders. He even seems inclined to defend as a wholesome practice the trick adopted by the Franciscans of counting money with a stick, inasmuch as their rule did not allow them to touch it.[3] He briefly touches the five other points, referring to others of his works in which they were more fully handled.

5. It might have been anticipated that so able, ingenious, and spirited a defence of the practices of the

[1] *Repressor*, ii. 414.

[2] The passage is somewhat curious for so acute a controversialist. "That Holy Scripture of the New Testament alloweth the same now said governance I may prove thus: Holy writ of the New Testament maketh mention, Johun first chapiter, that Christ said to Symount Peter thus, 'Thou art Symount the sone of Johanna, thou shalt be clepid Cephas or head,' and then Johun settith to this 'which is interpreted Peter.' Poul clepid Peter Cephas; and as Jerome witnesseth, Cephas is no word of Hebrew, but it is a word of Grew, in which language it is as myche as to say as Head."—*Repressor*, ii. 430. It is hardly necessary to say that St. Jerome does not indulge in any such etymological vagaries as are here imputed to him.

[3] *Repressor*, ii. 544.

Church would have been received with acclamation by Pecock's brethren. But such was not the case. The book, on the contrary, excited great anger and bitterness among Churchmen. Pecock was indeed promoted to the bishopric of Chichester by the influence of the Duke of Suffolk (1450), but this only served to increase his unpopularity, as his patron was generally detested. Matters seem to have come to a point with the bishop when, with a view of converting the Lollards, he published in 1456 a *Treatise on Faith.* In this he quits the ground of the infallibility of the Church, and argues that we ought to listen to authority, so long as the authority is not proved to be wrong. Very remarkably for one of his time he advocates the view that the truth of the Christian religion is not a matter of demonstration but one of probable argument, and that persecution is not justifiable until the proper means of persuasion have been tried. "The clergy," he says, "shall be condemned at the last day if by clear wit they draw not men into consent of true faith otherwise than by fire and sword and hangment, although I will not deny these second means to be lawful, provided the former be first used." "It was a shameful thing for the Christian Church to hold such a faith for substance of its salvation, and yet not to suffer it to be examined, it were imputing a villany to Christ that would give such a faith to his people, into which faith he would his people should turn all other people, and yet could not allow his faith to be full tried." "The Apostles intended not to give any catholic faith necessary to Christian men's salvation by word only to be kept without writing and remembrance. That they betoken not, out and besides holy Scripture, any articles unwritten to be believed for necessary faiths." The ceremonies of the Church were ordained not in apostolic times, and therefore do not stand on the same footing as doctrines. The Church and clergy have no power to make new doctrines. Holy writ is a more worthy ground of our faith than is the clergy of the whole Church on earth. The clergy may only declare and explain, the only authority is in Scripture. But every man is bound to obey the determinations of the Church, unless he can prove them to

be wrong. The Church has power to make positive ordinances, and to enforce them. There is nothing against the faith in priests having wives, which was permitted by the Apostle Paul; nor is there any Scripture, any distinction of meats and drinks, or any authority for eating fish at one season and flesh at another. Too many positive laws are a grievance and a snare. Christ is the Head of the Church which is founded on earth.[1] These views, so entirely alien from those which were held by his contemporary bishops, this bold quitting of the ground of tradition and infallible decrees of the Church, and basing all upon Scripture and reason, must have utterly appalled Pecock's brethren. He had begun by defending some of the worst abuses of the bishops and the Church. He had gradually written himself into clearer views.[2] He now severely commented upon the characters and practices of the clergy. The Friars were "pulpit-brawlers," and venters of "untrue fables." He had not feared to say that even the great doctors of the Church had no authority, save in so far as their opinions agreed with reason.

6. At a council held at Westminster, October 22, 1457, at which Pecock was present, a violent attack was made on the bishop, principally, as it seems, by the lay lords, and the archbishop was appealed to. The divines demanded that they might have copies of Pecock's books for examination. The archbishop (Bourchier) agreed, and Pecock professed himself ready to furnish them. He was ordered to appear at Lambeth, November 11, and to bring copies of his books with him. On the appointed day he appeared and brought nine of his works, among others the *Repressor* and the *Book of Faith*. They were entrusted to a committee of bishops and doctors to examine. These divines declared that the writings of Pecock contained many heretical opinions. In the numerous examinations

[1] Lewis's *Life of Pecock*, chap. v.; Babington's *Introd. to Pecock's Repressor*, p. xxxiii.

[2] This change in Pecock's views is often lost sight of by those who speak of him, as *e.g.*, by Dr. Hook in his *Life of Bourchier*. Dr. Hook seems to misunderstand Pecock, and attributes his condemnation entirely to political causes.

which the bishop now underwent, we find that his opponents relied entirely on authority and on sentences quoted from doctors (by which anything might be proved), and not at all upon Scripture and reason. They were not, in fact, competent either to understand or to combat Pecock's positions, and they were quickly constrained to have recourse to their old and familiar argument. Either he must recant and accept their dicta, or he must prepare for the stake.

7. Pecock was not disposed to accept this latter alternative. He does not appear to have held his opinions strongly, or to have been prepared to maintain them at the risk of his life. They were not, in fact, of a character which seemed to call for this. He had been the censor of the methods of reasoning used by the orthodox divines. He had displeased them by disparaging Church authority and condemning persecution. He had given greater prominence to the office of reason in controversies than they were disposed to allow. Still there was nothing in dispute which excited the bishop to be a martyr. It was shameful, doubtless, to recant, but the shame really was with those who forced the recantation upon him.[1] Consequently the bishop determined to accept the unpleasant office of recanting. On December 3, 1457, he abjured the condemned propositions at Lambeth in a written form, and the following day being Sunday, at Paul's Cross he made a public recantation in the presence of a vast crowd of people and four bishops. Some of the items of his recantation were clearly put in to justify the course which the bishops were taking, and which was really due to their anger at his views on Church authority. He was made to say that he had taught that it was not necessary to believe in Christ's descent into Hades,[2] or in the Holy Spirit, or in the cath-

[1] Dr. Hook says, as it seems without any proof, "This was evidently a party movement to deprive the Lancastrians of a popular writer" (v. 300). But the archbishop was a strong Lancastrian. It is surely unjustifiable to speak of Pecock in the way in which Dr. Hook does. "A bully in prosperity is generally a coward in adversity" (v. 304).

[2] In the short Creed contained in the *Donet*, the article of the

olic Church and the communion of saints; that he had taught that the Church universal might err in matters of faith; that it was not necessary to salvation to believe and accept what a General Council had decreed; that holy Scripture might be interpreted in a literal sense; and that no one is obliged to put another sense upon it. Having recited these errors in Latin, the bishop continued in English, declaring himself to have greatly erred, and that he now solemnly revoked and renounced all the errors aforesaid, and all other heresies and errors contained in his books, and that he submitted himself to the correction of the Church as a contrite and penitent sinner. And he desired that no man should give credence to his false and pernicious doctrines, nor keep any of his books, but bring them all to the archbishop or his commissaries; and he desired that all his books should be openly burnt. He then himself delivered a parcel of his books to the executioner to throw into the flames, and added, it seems somewhat needlessly, the exclamation, "My pride and presumption have brought upon me these troubles and reproaches." Pecock's recantation was certainly a remarkable one. "He retracted," says his latest able biographer, "errors which he had never uttered, and retracted utterances which he knew to be truths. But," he adds kindly, "indeed he seems to have been so confused and bewildered, as scarcely to know what he had said and what he had not said."[1] What was the state of the Church when a man in the position of Pecock, who had written temperately, learnedly, and with a sincere desire to bring back those who had altogether revolted from the faith of the Church —when such an one could be thus ignominiously trampled

Descent into Hell is omitted. Pecock knew what the men of his generation did not know, that the Creed was not composed by the Apostles, and that this article had no place in it at first.

[1] Babington, *Introd. to Pecock's Repressor*, p. i. Lewis points out that the third and fourth of the articles recanted were established by the Council of Trent. Mr. Babington further shows that it was perfectly untrue to say that Pecock was unsound in the matter of faith in the Trinity, and that his views as to the fallibility of the Church and of General Councils have been held by many great Roman doctors.

upon, because he had ventured to doubt the right of the Church to decide all controversies on the principle of

"Sic volo, sic jubeo, stet pro ratione voluntas"?

8. It would have been well for the reputation of the bishops of those days had the forced recantation, with all its falsified items, formed the extent of their persecution inflicted on the liberal-minded bishop. But, in fact, they persecuted him to death. Pecock had contrived to interest the Pope in his cause, and had even obtained bulls of restitution to his bishopric, of which he had been deprived. Whereupon the archbishop and other prelates went to the king and represented the enormity of one convicted of heresy obtaining bulls from the Pope contrary to the Statutes of Provisors, although all these prelates did, in fact, owe their appointments to the same source. The king induced Pecock to resign his bishopric, promising that he should be well provided for. The bishop resigned, and the good provision promised him was found to consist in an imprisonment in Thorney Abbey, where he remained till the day of his death. His biographer and editor's remarks on his character are valuable. "He would have been remarkable in any age, but was in his own age most remarkable. He was the enlightened advocate of toleration in times most intolerant; he was the acute propounder of a rational piety against unreasoning and most unreasonable opponents. His theological knowledge—scriptural, patristic, and scholastic—was for that age very considerable. He was, indeed, by far the most eminent and learned bishop of the Church of England in his time."[1]

9. Pecock's *Repressor*, and his opinions generally as set forth in his numerous works, were answered by John Bury, a brother of the order of the Eremite Friars of St. Augustine, in a treatise called *Gladius Salomonis*. The treatise is a very remarkable one. It assails Pecock's appeals to reason and the moral law, and his allowing them

[1] Babington, *Introd. to Pecock's Repressor*, p. lix. Gascoigne, an honest but somewhat childish writer, follows up Pecock with most persevering hostility, and heaps censures upon him. He regarded him as the apologist for the bad bishops. See Rogers's *Gascoigne*, pp. 26, 39, 49, 99, 216, etc.

a place of authority side by side with Scripture, exactly in the fashion that the Puritans of the next century used in arguing against the Church divines. Scripture, according to Bury, is all-sufficient. It contains all things needful; and reason, the moral law, and the teachings of nature, derive their only authority from its sanctions, and as far as they are contained in it. The friar writes apparently without the least consciousness how completely he is cutting away the ground from under his own feet, for by the strange glosses and mystical interpretations given to Scripture by the schoolmen and other mediæval writers, no doubt many honest men were persuaded that the whole of the Church system was to be found therein. That the argument of Bury was not only destructive of his own tenets, but was also radically false, while the views of Pecock were essentially true, need hardly be said after the immortal work of Hooker. "These, pretending the Scriptures perfection, infer thereupon that in Scripture all things lawful to be done must needs be contained. But admit this, and mark, I beseech you, what would follow. God, in delivering Scripture to His Church, should clean have abrogated amongst them the law of nature, which is an infallible knowledge imprinted in the minds of all the children of men, whereby both general principles for directing of human actions are comprehended, and conclusions derived from them; upon which conclusions groweth in particularity the choice of good and evil in the daily affairs of life. Admit this, and what shall the Scripture be but a snare and a torment to weak consciences, filling them with infinite perplexities, scrupulosities, doubts insoluble, and extreme despair? . . . We must take great heed lest in attributing to Scripture more than it can have, the incredibility of that do cause even those things which it hath most abundantly to be less reverently esteemed."[1]

[1] Hooker, *Eccl. Poly.*, B. ii. c. viii. 7.

CHAPTER XXIII.

ENGLAND AND ROME DURING FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

1390-1509.

1. Constant testimony of English legislation to the nationality and independence of the Church. 2. Laws passed in this direction under Henry IV. and Henry V. 3. Aggressions of Pope Martin V. 4. His imperious letter to Archbishop Chichele. 5. Orders him to obtain the repeal of the Præmunire Statute. 6. Calls on the King and Parliament for the repeal. 7. Again attacks the archbishop. 8. Attempts to supersede his legatine authority. 9. Political causes for defence of Chichele. 10. Granting of the See of Ely *in commendam*. 11. Attempt to use the Præmunire Statute against the national Church courts. 12. Cardinal Kemp archbishop. 13. Complete papalising of the Church of England under Cardinal Morton. 14. Archbishop Warham and his patronage of learning. 15. The method of reformation indicated.

1. In the preceding chapters the revolt against the doctrines and practices which had gradually grown up in the Mediæval Church of England, through papal influence and decrees, has been sketched. It now remains to trace the continuance, through the fifteenth century, of the struggle carried on by Rome, externally to dominate over and despoil the National Church. The opposition to the papal claims for dominion, traceable through the whole period from the settlement of the Conqueror, was indeed but feebly exhibited in the fifteenth century—first, because the times were full of trouble and civil war, but principally because almost all the bishops had themselves gained their Sees by simoniacal *Provisions* in despite of the law of the land. The lay mind of England had never hesitated or doubted as to the justice and necessity of restraining the Pope's influence, and though the kings often made use of it illegally to further their own selfish plans, yet the barons and commons were always true to the principle of the nationality of the Church. The re-enactment of the

Statute of Provisors in 1390, and the Statute of Præmunire in 1393, has been already mentioned. In the year 1399, at the time of the deposition of Richard II., one of the charges brought against the unhappy monarch was that he had ventured to apply to the Pope for a confirmation of his acts. Upon this the Parliament solemnly declares that "the Crown of England, and the rights of the same Crown, have been from all past time so free, that neither chief pontiff, nor any one else outside the kingdom, has any right to interfere in the same."[1] This principle, enunciated in the first place by William the Conqueror, and repeated energetically by the Parliament under Henry VIII., was the principle which, throughout the whole period between the Conquest and the Reformation, lay at the root of the legislation in this country on ecclesiastical matters. There are no English statutes recognising the jurisdiction of the Pope, or the right of the Pope to appropriate benefices in England, or to levy taxes and imposts. These things grew up by custom, but they grew up illegally, either against the provisions, or at any rate without the sanction of the law of the land. The spiritual supremacy and the ecclesiastical claims of the Pope, admitted more or less by all Churchmen in the Middle Ages, enabled the Roman bishop, acting upon the devotion or the fears of those who were pledged to honour him, to establish an *imperium in imperio*, which all the statutes passed to restrain it availed only very imperfectly to curb. In spite of Statutes of Provisors, the Pope still provided for bishoprics, and nominated his courtiers to English benefices. In spite of Statutes of Præmunire, his bulls and ordinances still had power in the country, and appeals were carried to his courts. But it is evident that these laws, nevertheless, served a very valuable purpose. For, first, they enunciated

[1] Quamvis corona regni Angliæ et jura ejusdem coronæ, ipsumque regnum, fuerint ab omni tempore retroacto adeo libera quod dominus summus pontifex nec aliquis alius extra regnum ipsum se intromittere debeat de eisdem, tamen præfatus rex, ad roborationem statutorum suorum erroneorum, supplicavit domino papæ quod statuta in ultimo parliamento suo ordinata reformaret."—*Rot. Parl.*, ii. 419 ; Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, ii. 505.

and kept alive the principle of the true nationality of the Church of England; and next, they did actually to a very considerable extent restrain the exercise of papal jurisdiction and papal exactions. It was this which caused the Præmunire Statute of 1393 to be so deeply resented by Pope Martin V.,[1] that most pretentious of popes, whose appointment had resulted from the clearance of the three opposing popes made by the Council of Constance, and which brought him into sharp collision with the English Primate.

2. Legislation in the direction of the Provisors and Præmunire Statutes was continued in the reigns of Henry IV. and V., although the statutes passed did not attain any special prominence. By 7 Henry IV. c. 6, penalties were enacted against those who purchased bulls to exempt them from tithes. By 1 Henry V. c. 7, aliens were restrained from accepting benefices in England. By 3 Henry V. st. ii. c. 4, incumbents are protected against intruders having "Provisions" from the Pope, even though such intruders have the royal license to execute such provisions. That such a statute as this latter should have been necessary, that alien incumbents provided by the Pope should not even have had the decency to wait for the vacancy, but should strive to make their profit out of the benefice even when the incumbent was alive, shows us to what a height this abuse had grown.

3. Defensive legislation was at this period much needed by the Church of England, for in Martin V. the papal chair had found an occupant more daring in pretension and more unhesitating in action than any who had sat in it for centuries. After the breaking up of the Council of Constance, the new Pope, acting upon the principle of the invalidity of acts done during the schism, made void the elections of many chapters, and proceeded to *provide* bishops for no less than thirteen Sees in the province of Canterbury.[2] He made his nephew Prosper Colonna, a youth of but fourteen years of age, archdeacon of Canterbury. He undertook to act as a general regulator of discipline within the Church

[1] Martin was nominated for the Papacy by the bishop of London, and supported by the English influence.—Wals., *Hist. Ang.*, ii. 320.

[2] Collier, *Eccl. Hist.*, iii. 327.

of England, appropriating and consolidating churches, giving incumbents a dispensation for non-residence, and allowing laymen to receive payments out of Church revenues. At the same time it was complained that no Englishman could obtain a favour from him in his court of Rome. Remonstrances had been made against these proceedings by the English ambassadors, before the Council of Constance had concluded its session, and the Pope had promised to be somewhat more considerate in his proceedings. A sort of concordat indeed was entered into between the Pope and the Church of England.[1] But very soon after this it was necessary again to send an embassy to this aggressive Pontiff, warning him not to interfere with any preferments belonging to the Crown. The Pope appears to have hesitated to promise this, holding as he did that all preferments belonged of right to him; but he was informed of the character of the English laws, which forbade such intrusions, and told that it was only out of respect to his office that the king had sent messengers to him. He might have compassed the same end simply by enforcing the law. About the same time the law was actually put in force against him by the Chapter of York, who refused to accept the bishop of Lincoln, who had been provided by the Pope to the archiepiscopal See, alleging against him the Statute of Provisors.[2]

4. To be checked in this way by a law which presumed to limit the rights and privileges of the Vicar of Christ, was no doubt very exasperating to a Pontiff of the temper of Martin V., and he proceeded to expend his wrath upon Archbishop Chichele. He writes to him and to the Archbishop of York, that he has heard that they and some other bishops ventured to dispose of certain benefices, canonries, prebends, dignities, parsonages, and offices in churches, cathedral or collegiate, which belong to the disposition of the Roman See, either by the common right, or by the Constitution of John XXII., which begins "Execrabilis," or of that of Benedict XII., which begins "Ad Regimen;" which thing, says the Pope, tends to the soul's danger, and

[1] Collier, *u. s.*

[2] Duck., *Vita Chichele*, quoted by Collier, iii. 327-9.

the contempt of the Roman See. He forbids them, therefore, under pain of excommunication, to collate to these benefices, and he bids the archbishops inform the other prelates of his commands. He calls upon them to disregard the statutes of Edward and Richard, "which, inasmuch as they are expressly against the liberty of the Church, we declare to have been and to be condemned and reprobated."[1] This was a recurrence to the days of Innocent III., and his declaration against the Great Charter. But there was no Archbishop Langton now at the head of the English Church, to make a becoming answer to the arrogant Pontiff.

5. Archbishop Chichele, though not devoid of spirit, yet did not regard the papal intrusion from the national stand-point. He answered apologetically, defending himself from the charge of not being ready to carry out the papal wishes. He was, he says, the only prelate in England who ventured to accept the promotion of foreigners. The other bishops disregarded solemn apostolical injunctions, and even divine censures, and refused to do this. He alone was hardy enough to do it.[2] To this the Pope replies in a bitter strain of anger and reproof. "If you desire to excuse yourself with us you must act effectively, for it is not words but deeds which produce confidence. Labour therefore with all your might that that execrable statute put forth against the liberty of the Church in the kingdom of England may be abolished, and keep it not, nor, as much as lieth in you, permit it to be kept; and reprove and chide those who keep it in season and out of season, as the Apostle bids, if you desire to show your innocence in the sight of God and man. Perform efficaciously that which we have enjoined you and the other prelates of the kingdom by our other letters under ecclesiastical censure, namely, by going to the place where the counsellors of the kingdom assemble, and instructing them, both ecclesiastical and secular, monishing and exhorting them, that the aforesaid

[1] Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 471-2.

[2] "Heu, pater beate, experientia docet quod, non obstantibus ambassiatis solennibus, immo et requisitionibus apostolicis, etiam sub censuris divinis, non est in regno qui quidquam in promotionibus extraneorum auderet, nisi solus ego."—Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 473.

statute, which is opposed to divine and human law and reason, which cannot be preserved without the destruction of eternal salvation and the utter disgrace of the kingdom, may be altogether abolished."[1]

6. The utter ignorance displayed by the Pope in this letter, as to the English Constitution and the power of the archbishop to control Parliament, may well surprise us. Still more astonishing were the proceedings with which he followed up this sharp lecture to the Primate. As an ecclesiastic who had pledged himself to obey the Pope, Chichele might be regarded as in some sort amenable to his censures, but when the Pope proceeded to write severely to the King[2] and to the Parliament, demanding, on peril of their salvation, the immediate repeal of the Præmunire Statute, so bold an assumption of dictatorial power almost surpassed the proceedings of Innocent himself. "We are they," said the Pope, "who are placed by the power of Almighty God over you, and over the universal Church."[3] "This statute is opposed to all divine and human laws, to the authority of the Old Testament and the New, to the decrees of councils, fathers, and popes, to the customs of the universal Church. Do such laws as these become a Catholic prince and a Christian people? That priests of God, ministers of the Church, Christian pastors, without fault, without crime, should incur worse penalties than Jews or Saracens? This statute throws into confusion the whole ecclesiastical state, and brings into the royal courts

[1] Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 474.

[2] It is clear from the internal evidence that this letter *must* have been addressed to Henry V., and not to the child king Henry VI. The date therefore assigned to it, viz. the tenth year of the pontificate, 1427, must be wrong, and Collier must be in error in his arrangement of the letters. I have arranged them as the internal evidence seems to indicate, disregarding the dates assigned, which seem to have been tampered with. See Spencer's *Life of Chichele*, p. 108, note.

[3] Wilkins, iii. 480. Pope Martin V. is usually regarded as the founder of modern Papacy. He quitted the ground of the older Popes, which was that the Metropolitans had certain powers, but that the Pope was the supreme judge in case of reference or appeal, and assumed the position that the Pope was universal ordinary of the whole Church, and all bishops but his deputies.

the greater causes of churches, dignities, and benefices, and the provisions to them in cases prohibited by law; and disposes of ecclesiastical affairs just as if the King and not the Pope were appointed the Vicar of Christ."[1]

7. In spite, however, of all this violent tirade, the statute still remained untouched. After the death of the gallant King Henry V., when the possessor of the Crown was an infant and the regency was in the hands of the Duke of Gloucester, the Pope returned to the charge against the Præmunire Statute with unabated vigour. The King of England, he says, disposes of benefices as though he were the Vicar of Christ, and makes laws concerning clerks and churches as though he had the keys of the Church in his hands, and not Peter. All men may go freely to England except those who receive benefices by the authority of the Chief Pontiff, the Vicar of Jesus Christ. These are bidden to be exiled, to be seized, incarcerated, spoiled of their goods. The executors of the apostolical letters, the proctors, the notaries, and all others who carry any process or censure from the apostolical court, are exposed to the utmost punishment, and are put out of the protection of the law, being liable to be made captive by all. "Show to them," he writes to the archbishop, "the sin which they who observe the aforesaid statute bring upon themselves, and bring the evil and the rough into good and plain ways."[2] Moved by these exhortations, the archbishop and the bishops did actually go in solemn form to the Commons in Parliament, exhorting them to consider whether these statutes, which so much offended the Pope, could not be modified.[3] But instead of yielding to the archbishop's request, the Commons determined upon presenting a petition to the king, praying him to uphold the liberties of the Church of England against the papal aggressions. They desired that the English ambassadors might be instructed to demand that the Pope should cease from his aggressions, and not give credence to any evil reports against the Archbishop of Canterbury.[4]

8. Pope Martin, thus foiled in his schemes, was determined to punish the archbishop, and as the most effectual

[1] Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 481. [2] *Ib.*, iii. 483. [3] *Ib.*, iii. 484.
[4] See Hook's *Lives of Archbishops*, v. 102.

way of doing so, he proceeded to take away his ordinary legatine authority, not by appointing a *legatus a latere*, as popes had frequently done before, but by bestowing the ordinary legatine authority on another bishop, Henry Beaufort, bishop of Winchester. He also excommunicated the bishops and threatened the country with an interdict.[1] The Pope's bulls arrived in England, and were carried to the archbishop, but they were immediately impounded by the order of the Lord Protector, and taken unopened into the royal archives[2] (1427).

9. Political causes had indeed much to do with this prompt defence of the archbishop. Beaufort, the son of John of Gaunt, and great-uncle to the infant king, was the rival of the Duke of Gloucester, the king's uncle and the Protector. Gloucester appears to have favoured the national side in Church politics, and Beaufort had lent himself completely to the Pope. Created by him a cardinal,[3] it was intended that he should have the further honour of the legateship, and thus completely supersede the Archbishop of Canterbury. Gloucester's prompt action, and the formal appeal at once made by Archbishop Chichele to a General Council,[4] disconcerted this plan. The cardinal never acted as Legate in England, and he had to display his zeal for the Pope by acting as generalissimo in the crusade against the Hussites in Bohemia, for which he was weakly allowed to raise men and money in England.[5]

[1] Gascoigne, *Dict. Theol.* (ed. Rogers), p. 17. In 1221 Archbishop Langton had obtained a promise that the ordinary legateship should always be attached to the Primacy. The archbishops were henceforth styled *legati nati*. But extraordinary legates (*legati a latere*) were often sent by the Pope, as Otho, Othobon, and Guy Foulquois.

[2] Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 486.

[3] Beaufort was nominated to the cardinalate as early as December 28, 1417, by Martin V. at the Council of Constance. Chichele addressed a strong protest on the matter to Henry V., and Henry refused him leave to accept the dignity, saying "he had as leef sette his coroune besyde hym as to se him were a cardinal's hatte, he being a cardinal." The second nomination was made May 24, 1426, the title being that of St. Eusebius; on the 25th of the next March (1427) he received the cardinal's hat at Rouen.—Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii. 108, note.

[4] Wilkins, iii. 485.

[5] A further great quarrel took place between Gloucester and Cardinal

10. In the great dispute between Pope Eugenius and the Council of Basle, as to which of the two was to be predominant—the Council or the Pope—the English clergy were divided in their opinions. The bishops for the most part supported the claims of the Pope, the lower clergy upheld those of the Council.[1] But though the archbishop might in theory accept the high claims made for the authority of the Pope, yet when they were exercised in such a way as grievously to interfere with the rights of the English Church, he could summon up courage to make some resistance to them. About the year 1438 there occurred an invasion of the English Church by Rome, which was absolutely unprecedented in all the previous struggles of the National Church against the Papacy. Pope Eugenius ventured to bestow the bishopric of Ely on Lewis, Archbishop of Tours, to hold *in commendam* with his archbishopric. Here it was not only a question of a grievous injury done to the See, but also a contemptuous insult to the whole Church of England. The archbishop at once brought the matter before the Convocation, and no doubt the opinion of the clergy would be with him in resenting the proceeding. But the opposition to the Pope, like all the rest of Chichele's transactions with Rome, was feeble and half-hearted. The Archbishop of Rouen did not indeed become bishop of Ely, or receive the spiritualties, but he obtained that which he probably coveted most, viz. the temporalties of the See—which he was allowed to enjoy under the title of perpetual administrator of the See of Ely.[2]

11. During all this century the discontent of the laity with the clergy, which had been first evoked by the Wicliffite movement, continued steadily to increase. A constant grievance was the action of the Church courts, the proceedings of which were arbitrary, vexatious, and often flagrantly unjust. The action of these courts was con-

Beaufort (1) as to whether a cardinal could hold an English bishopric, and (2) whether a cardinal could sit in the royal council. Beaufort appears to have been successful in both these points.

[1] Collier, iii. 358, 369.

[2] *Ib.*, iii. 369, from Chichele's Register; Gascoigne, *Dict. Theol.* (ed. Rogers), p. 136.

tinually interfered with by the prohibitions of the secular courts,[1] but this was not enough. Towards the middle of the century the lawyers appear to have thought that they had discovered a grand secret, which should cut away at once and for ever the whole jurisdiction of these courts. The Præmunire Statute directed the penalties of the Act against those who should purchase or pursue, or cause to be purchased or pursued, in the Court of Rome or[2] *elsewhere*, "any such translations, processes, sentences of excommunication, bulls, instruments, or any other things which touch the king, against him, his regality, or his realm." The lawyers interpreted this clause to apply to all ecclesiastical judges or officers who should in any, even the smallest, particular interfere with the king's courts and their jurisdiction. So that for the future, instead of a prohibition issuing to stop the ecclesiastical suit, an action under the *Præmunire* Statute might be commenced against the promoter of such a suit, involving the loss of all goods, perpetual imprisonment, etc. The clergy were naturally alarmed at this interpretation. In 1439, and again in 1447, the Convocation petitioned the Crown that the Præmunire Statute might be held to apply only to suits, processes, bulls, etc., made in *the Court of Rome*. It was never intended, say they, to apply to any but Roman acts. "Nevertheless, now of late time some men have entended and plyned them to make to strange and bitter interpretations of the said statute, such as if it should be suffered and have place, should turn to intolerable hurt and prejudice of the said prelates, and of spiritual judges in the land, into whose favour the said statute was first made. They deem therefore that it may be declared that the statute only refers to suits of the Court of Rome."[3] There was nothing in these remonstrances which supported the views of Pope Martin as to the Præmunire Statute. The bishops and clergy complained not because the statute unjustly curbed the Roman jurisdiction, but because it was

[1] Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 523.

[2] The real explanation of *elsewhere* is that the Papacy was not always located at Rome, but sometimes at other cities, as Lyons, Avignon, etc.

[3] Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 534, 556.

not applied solely to that for which it was intended, but by a piece of legal chicanery made to affect the national Courts Christian.[1] It was not till some time after this—during the reign of Edward IV.—that the pretences of the lawyers were disposed of by an ordinance which declared that the Præmunire Statute was not to be interpreted as referring to proceedings in English courts.[2]

12. The closing of the schism which had arisen out of the proceedings of the Council of Basle, and the appointment of a popular Pope in the person of Nicholas V. (1447), gave to the papal chair an increase of influence and authority in England. It is true that when the Pope—who had presented the King of England with the Golden Rose as a mark of his appreciation of his piety and devotion—sought to be allowed to raise a tenth from the English clergy, the King resisted the attempt, and the archbishop was not allowed to proceed in the matter.[3] Yet, during the weak reign of Henry VI., and under the influence of Queen Margaret, the papal power rapidly grew in England. Cardinal Beaufort died in 1447, but there was another cardinal in England—Kemp, Archbishop of York[4]—who upheld the same policy which had been advocated by Beaufort, viz. the obliteration of the national character of the Church, and its complete subservience and submission to Rome. This Lancastrian policy, which lost France, sacrificed the King to a mean alliance, and made the Pope the ordinary of England, was intensely unpopular in the country. The clergy preached against it; Lollardism began to be again prominent. The extreme unpopularity

[1] See Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii. 331, note.

[2] Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 583-4. A curious illustration of the way in which the Præmunire Statute might be used against the clergy is found in the case of Richard Hunne, which made so much noise in the time of Henry VIII. Hunne was sued by the priest for a mortuary in the Court Christian. He retaliated by bringing an action under the Præmunire Statute against the priest.

[3] Collier, iii. 382.

[4] Kemp was made cardinal by the title of St. Balvina by Eugenius IV., December 18, 1439, and Cardinal-Bishop of St. Rufina, July 21, 1452. There is a high panegyric on him in a letter of Henry VI. to the Queen on the occasion of his promotion.—Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii. 164, note. Gascoigne gives him a very bad character.

which assailed bishop Pecock was due to his having ventured to preach up this authority of the Pope. Nevertheless, in 1452, at the death of Archbishop Stafford, the final step in this anti-national policy was taken by the appointment of Cardinal Kemp to the Primacy. Kemp was first raised to the dignity of Cardinal-Bishop by the title of St. Rufina, then appointed to the primacy by provision of the Pope, and finally constituted Legate *a latere*. He thus became altogether a Roman prelate in England, and for the first time in the history of the English Church, an Archbishop of Canterbury—the successor of Augustine, Anselm, and Langton—*alterius orbis Papa*—was contented to govern the great Church of England as the Legate *a latere* of the Roman pontiff. In order to do this, he not only had to pay vast sums of money for the papal bulls, but he also was constrained to perjure himself, swearing first of all fealty and allegiance to the Church of Rome, and then, in his oath to the king, "knowledging himself to hold his archbishopric of the king only."[1]

13. The Primate who had thus betrayed the liberties of the English Church was succeeded (1454) by another, who in due time became a cardinal also (1465).[2] This prelate, Archbishop Bourchier, who presided over the English Church during the whole period of the troublous Wars of the Roses, and into the beginning of the reign of Henry VII., contrived to keep well with both the contending parties; but, with the exception of his prosecution of Bishop Pecock, which has been already narrated, there is scarce anything to note ecclesiastically of his work, and certainly no stand was made under his guidance against the overweening pretensions of Rome.[3] He was succeeded by Morton, bishop of Ely (1486), who also reached the cardinalate; and deservedly, if the devoted partisanship of Rome

[1] See Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops*, v. 258, *sq.*

[2] Bourchier was first named a cardinal in 1464, but not regularly appointed till the following year, and he did not receive the red hat till 1472.—Hook, v. 346.

[3] The nation and Church of England owes Archbishop Bourchier a debt of gratitude for his share in the introduction of printing into England. Mr. Rogers calls him "selfish, sordid, heartless."—*Gascoigne*, p. 75.

and the desire completely to efface the nationality of the English Church constituted a merit.[1] To Morton may be ascribed the successful completion of that policy which was commenced by Kemp—the throwing of the clergy of the Church of England absolutely into the arms of Rome. Becoming more and more the objects of suspicion and dislike to the laity, the clergy readily grasped at this means of support and aid. At the same time the king, bent upon absolute government, and desiring help in his schemes, willingly purchased the papal aid by the most complete surrender of his duties as the defender of the Church. Under Morton, therefore, the National Church of England might almost be said to cease to exist, and to become instead a portion of the Church of Rome located in England. With an utter disregard of the spirit of the Præmunire Statute, the king even obtained bulls from Rome to help him in his state policy.[2] Envoys, furnished with the papal authorisation, were allowed openly to traffic in the sale of pardons for every crime except those directed against the Pope and the clergy. There could scarcely be a more complete contrast than between the state of the Church of England under Henry VII. and its condition under Edward I. or Edward III. Its spirit, its power of resistance, its national character, were broken down ; and, together with the weakness of internal demoralisation, of which some details will presently be given, the weakness of external incapacity pressed heavily upon it. It became the mere creature of the State, because the State could wield at will the power of the Pope. Its energy, its self-assertion, its self-respect, were gone ; an absolute necessity was established that, if the Church of England was to retain any portion of its national character, its whole status must undergo a thorough sifting and a complete reformation.

[1] Bacon's character of Morton is—"He was a wise man and an eloquent, but in his nature harsh and haughty ; much accepted by the King, but envied by the nobility and hated by the people."—*Hen. VII.*, p. 182 (Ed. 1876).

[2] As in the case of the excommunication of the Irish prelates who had helped Lambert Simnel.

14. The first movement towards an improved state of things may be said to have begun, when, after the short primacy of Henry Deane, 1501-1503, William Warham was translated from London to Canterbury. Warham was a learned man, but his value to the Church consisted not so much in his own learning as in the patronage which he readily extended to men who were destined to make a deep mark on the history of their times. By his support of Erasmus, Warham was helping to fashion a keen weapon for slaying some of the most grotesque monsters of the old superstition; and by his loyal patronage of John Colet was upholding the first of that school of Scriptural reformers who were destined to do so much for the Church of England. The archbishop's own views of reformation did not probably extend much beyond the regulation of the Church courts and matters of detail.[1] He could tolerate such popes as Alexander VI. and Julius II., and calmly discuss with the king the projects of these pontiffs for a "holy war" against the Turks. Yet Warham was a prelate of a different type of churchmanship from Courtney and Arundel, and less papal than Morton and Kemp; and by his somewhat more liberal views he was unconsciously laying the foundation for much of the work that was to follow.

15. When that work began, it was a fortunate thing for England, that men, looking back over the history of the nation, could see that there had been, ever since the Conquest, a continuous struggle in the English Church between a foreign intruding element and a national element—that they could perceive that most of the evils of which there was just reason to complain in the Church had come through the foreign influence, and that, if this foreign influence were removed, there could at any rate be nothing to hinder the National Church from shaking itself free from any mischiefs or imperfections which might be proved to exist in it. History thus clearly pointed out the true way of reformation. Men saw that the right method was to make the policy of the many Provisors and Præmunire Statutes of their ancestors a real and effective one. That, following in the same lines as the Constitutions of Clarendon,

[1] See Collier, iii. 454.

the Statutes of Edward III. and Richard II., their wisdom was to give the finishing touch to the edifice by altogether breaking off relations with the Pope, and by establishing the nationality of the Church of England, for which their fathers had struggled, once and for ever, on a firm and secure basis. This was the work of the English Reformation.[1]

[1] By the publication of a volume of extracts from Gascoigne's *Theological Dictionary*, edited by Professor Rogers, we are put in possession of the judgment of a contemporary, who was no heretic, but a high Churchman, on the ecclesiastical state of England in the fifteenth century. Nothing can be more severe than his condemnation of the action of the Popes on the English Church. He mentions one monstrous instance of a pope (Eugenius IV.) giving license to a man who was an absolute fool, and not in holy orders, to hold a rich archdeaconry and twelve prebends, none of which he ever visited, but spent his time in drunkenness and debauchery. See pp. 166, 168, 169, 173. Gascoigne is also most condemnatory of the morals of the clergy, and throws great light on many of the points touched on in the following chapter.

CHAPTER XXIV.

PRACTICAL RELIGION IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

1. Character of the clergy of the fifteenth century. 2. The Popes of the fifteenth century. 3. Bishop Hallam's protests at Pisa and Constance: the Council of Basle. 4. The English bishops generally free from open vice. 5. Immorality of the lower clergy. 6. The testimony of the University of Oxford. 7. Archbishop Bourchier's censure. 8. Archbishop Morton's directions. 9. The monasteries—colleges take their place. 10. Pope Innocent's bull. 11. The Abbey of St. Albans. 12. The Friars. 13. The Chantry priests. 14. Secular employment of clergy. 15. Amount of learning in clerical body. 16. Simony of the clergy. 17. Discipline exercised by clergy. 18. Instruction of the laity—sermons. 19. Manuals of instruction. 20. The "Visions of Piers Plowman." 21. Scriptural manuals. 22. The Primer. 23. Pilgrimage and relic-worship forced on the laity. 24. Defence of these by Bishop Pecock. 25. Indulgences. 26. False doctrines forced upon the laity. 27. The wealth and power of the clergy. 28. Erasmus and Colet.

1. It will not be found, probably, at any period of Church history, that the character of the clergy rises far above that of the laity of the same era, and hence, during the specially troubled periods of the Middle Age—in the reigns of Stephen, of John, of Edward II.—clerical scandals will appear side by side with those of the laity. There are, however, periods when the clerical character seems to sink below that of the laity, and to give just offence to them by its inconsistency with the object and purpose for which the clerical office exists. Such a period was the fifteenth century. To establish this recourse need not be had to the declamations of the Lollards, whose views might be held to be prejudiced. It will be easily established by the admissions of the clergy themselves—the censures of bishops, of councils, of universities, of private clerks.

2. The popes were regarded as the spiritual heads of the Church. Their decrees and censures were more or less

respected; their example may be held to have had at least some weight. But the most ardent admirers of the papacy will scarcely maintain that the popes of this period presented a salutary model for the imitation of the clergy. Boniface IX. was the most accomplished simoniac of his day. He not only sold all benefices, but he sold them many times over, sometimes in the same week.[1] Of the two popes deposed by the Council of Pisa, the Council formally declares that they are guilty of notorious crimes—obstinate schismatics, heretics, perjurers, scandalous.[2] John XXIII. was proved at the Council of Constance to be "a pirate, a tyrant, an adulterer, a violator of nuns."[3] Martin V. and Eugenius IV. must divide between them the hideous cruelties of the Hussite wars; to the latter belongs the special infamy of the butchery of the Colonnas. History has long since pointed to Alexander VI. as one of the prodigies of crime; and to Alexander succeeded Julius, a brutal leader of mercenary brigands.

3. Prelates and clergy might thus find easily an excuse for irregularities by the example of those in the highest places in the Church. All the more creditable to them is it when we meet with in any of them an emphatic protest against such corruptions. Such a protest was made by Robert Hallam, bishop of Salisbury, at the Councils of Pisa and Constance. Hallam, who had been Chancellor of Oxford, and was an able and learned as well as upright man, was one of the English deputies commissioned to both these Councils.[4] In both of them he vigorously denounced the corruptions prevalent in the Church. Nominated a cardinal by John XXIII.,[5] he declined to accept the dignity from such a source, and at Constance was one of the most forward accusers of this scandalous prelate, declaring that he ought to be burned at the stake. That, however, all the strong language used at Constance came practically to nothing, may be inferred from the records of the Council

[1] Theod. à Niem, quoted Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, vi. 259.

[2] Labbe, *Concil.*, xi. 2128. Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.*, 100, 30.

[3] Milman, *L. C.* vi. 84. [4] Labbe, *Concil.*, xi. 2214; xii. 184.

[5] June 6, 1411. But as he was absent, no title was assigned to him. Fleury, 100, 48.

of Basle. The Emperor Sigismund, appalled at the profligacy of the clergy, instructed John of Lubeck to make a formal demand for the abolition of the rule as to clerical celibacy. "Nothing could be more fearfully serious than the representation on this subject which John was to lay before each deputation, and urge in the strongest manner. After centuries of strife, after all the laws of Hildebrand and his successors, the whole clergy are declared to be living with concubines, in adultery or worse. They were hated by the whole laity as violating their marriage beds; confession was become odious." [1]

4. There is no reason to believe that the state of things in England was as bad as this. The bishops, though grievously negligent of their duties, did not display any such open immorality as was to be found in some of the Continental churches. Speaking generally of the Middle Age, Mr. Stubbs says:—"The higher class of clergy were free from any general faults of this kind. After the twelfth century, when many of the bishops were, if not married, at least the fathers of semi-legitimate families, the episcopal character for morality stands deservedly high. The great abbots were, with equally rare exceptions, men of high character." [2]

5. But of the lower clergy, the same writer is constrained to declare from an examination of the legal and historical records touching the nature of the purity of the clergy, that there is "a long story of licensed and unlicensed concubinage, and appendant to it much miscellaneous profligacy, and a general low tone of morality in the very point that is supposed to be secured. . . . The records of the spiritual courts of the Middle Ages remain in such quantity and such concord of testimony, as to leave no doubt of the facts; among the laity, as well as among the clergy of the towns and clerical centres, there existed an amount of coarse vice which had no secrecy to screen it or prevent it from spreading." [3]

6. In the year 1414 the University of Oxford made a representation to the king, with a view to its being put

[1] Milman, *Lat. Christianity*, vi. 259.

[2] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii. 373. [3] Stubbs, *u. s.*

into the hands of the English deputies proceeding to Constance. This document states that the most unworthy and unqualified persons were constantly admitted into orders; that prelates unblushingly ordained and preferred their relatives, when young boys, without obliging them to take the clerical tonsure, or to relinquish fashionable dress; that these youths conducted themselves with the greatest insolence, never saying the canonical lessons, or assuming any part of the clerical character, but giving themselves up to pleasure, revelling, and feasting in the towns and the houses of the nobility, without any thought of the cure of souls; that the cathedrals were monopolised by a few residents, who had contrived to make the coming into residence so expensive a matter that the majority of the canons were kept out, and the service of the Church languished; that appropriations of churches to sees and monasteries caused a great mischief to the parishioners, the care of whom was utterly neglected—while the revenues of the churches were often consumed in squabbles between the religious orders, as to which of them the right to prey upon the Church belonged; that abbots assumed the insignia and the position of bishops; that many obtained promotions who were absolutely ignorant of the language of the country, and could not instruct their people; that continual quarrels were going on between the secular clergy and the Mendicants; that the Mendicants were constantly entrapping or enticing young children to enter their order against the wishes of their parents; that there was no efficient examination of persons before ordination; that persons absolutely illiterate obtained orders; that priests led an openly dissolute life, to the scandal of the Church, and committed fornication without any censure save a small pecuniary mulct, being not even debarred from the celebration of mass; that clergy affected the dress and manners of soldiers, and indulged in every luxury of apparel.[1]

7. This grave indictment of the clergy at the beginning of the fifteenth century corresponds but too well with other documents of later date. About the year 1434 both the

[1] Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 360-365. See Gascoigne, *Dict. Theol.*, p. 148.

Universities of Oxford and Cambridge make complaint to the bishops, that persons utterly unqualified, ignorant, and of bad character, were freely admitted into orders, in consequence of which the universities were deserted, and no good preparation for the clerical office took place.[1] In 1455 Archbishop Bourchier issued a commission for reforming the clergy. He complains that there were some regulars who had thrown off the habit of their order and wore secular dress; that some parish priests, who were bound to reside on their benefices, wandered loose and dissolute through the kingdom, giving themselves up to drinking bouts, fornications, adulteries, and other crimes, leaving all care for their benefices, the buildings of which fell into dilapidation; that many wandering priests were to be found who were ready to act as curates or chantry priests, who were altogether unknown, and had no letters testimonial. Some of these were senseless persons (idiotæ) and unlearned, and their ministrations were dangerous to souls.[2]

8. In 1486 Archbishop Morton issued a letter containing directions as to the life and character of clerks. He complains that the clergy have so cast away clerical decency as to wear utterly unseemly clothing, affecting the fashions of the laity, and that they neglected their duty of residence on their cures.[3]

9. Nor were worldliness, carelessness, and immorality confined to the secular clergy. They were to be found, at this period at least, as prevalent in the monasteries. The proof of the decadence in the value set upon monastic life is most clearly exhibited by a glance at the direction which

[1] Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 528-530. [2] *Ib.*, 574.

[3] *Ib.*, iii. 619-20. The archbishop is specially severe on the fashion of wearing cloaks open in front. Clerks are to wear their garments "ab anteriori parte clausas," and not to wear a hood "penulatum aut duplicatum cum serico, seu simplex cum corneto vel liripipio brevi vel shameleto circa collum suum publice; sed utatur quilibet talis presbyter, nullatenus graduatus, caputio cum liripipio longo suo ordini conveniente." The liripipium was a long peak or tail. The clergy were also forbidden to wear swords, daggers, or belts adorned with gold, and their tonsures were to show a clear *corona*, and their ears were to be seen. See Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops*, v. 450.

donations for religious purposes took during this period. Monasteries had ceased to be founded, and in place of them we have the grand foundations of the two St. Mary Winton Colleges by William of Wykeham; of Eton and King's by King Henry VI.; of Lincoln College by Bishop Flemyng; of All Souls by Archbishop Chichele; of Magdalen, Oxford, by Bishop Waynflete; of Corpus Christi by Bishop Foxe; of Christ's and St. John's by the Lady Margaret. For many of these great foundations (as, notably, for Wykeham's, Chichele's, and Waynflete's) monastic houses were suppressed under royal license, and a precedent was established, which afterwards served the purposes of Wolsey and Henry VIII. With regard to Bishop Foxe's foundation of Corpus, it is known that he had purposed to found a monastery, but was dissuaded from this by the wise advice of Bishop Oldham, who suggested to him that monastic foundations had had their day, and were not likely to continue much longer.

10. Indeed, the state of many of them at this period was sufficiently self-condemnatory. A bull, issued in 1489 by Pope Innocent VIII. to Archbishop Morton, declares that the Pope has been informed that the inmates of *many monasteries in England* led a lascivious and dissolute life, to the destruction of their souls, the offence of the Divine Majesty, and the disgrace of religion. The archbishop is, therefore, bid to visit the religious houses in head and members, to inflict censures, to expel the incorrigible, and, if necessary, to call in the aid of the secular arm.[1]

11. One record of the archbishop's proceedings under this mandate remains, and it draws an appalling picture of the state of one of the greatest and most famous religious houses of England. Archbishop Morton writes to the abbot of St. Alban's telling him that he has been accused to him by credible witnesses of simony, usury, dilapidation, and waste, and of certain enormous crimes. That he had been remiss, prodigal, and negligent in managing the affairs of the abbey. That the monks under him were leading a lascivious life, and, horrible to say, were polluting the holy places, and even the very house of God itself, by commit-

[1] Wilkins, iii. 631. See Gascoigne, *Dict Theol.*, p. l.

ting acts of incest with nuns, and sometimes, in their quarrels, by the shedding of blood. The abbot had admitted one Ellen Germyn, a notoriously adulterous woman, into the priory of Pray, which was under his jurisdiction, and made her prioress; and Thomas Sudbury, one of the monks, was in the habit of constantly going to her for immoral purposes, and others of the monks also went there to her and to other of the nuns as to a public brothel. And not alone at Pray, but in the house of nuns at Sapwell, the abbot changed the prioresses as he pleased, deposing good and virtuous women, and placing the vicious in high places. The goods of the abbey were also wasted by peculations and unfair dealings. Persons of the worst character were put in as officers to manage the estates. Timber to the value of 8000 marks had been cut down and sold. Divine worship was neglected. Common prostitutes were frequently brought within the boundaries of the abbey. Sacred vessels and relics were sold.[1] It is not, of course, intended to imply that this terrible picture of immorality and abuse was applicable to all the abbeys of England, many of which were doubtless under good discipline. But that one of the most conspicuous and famous houses of England—the first which reached the dignity of a mitred abbot—should have attained to such a pitch of licentiousness without outcry or protest, or, as far as appears, any attempt to correct it, until the Pope's bull arrived, shows that the case of St. Alban's was not exceptional, but that men's minds had become habituated to the spectacle of grievous abuses in the monastic body.

12. As to the Friars—if we are to give any weight at all to the satirical poems, to such writers as Langland and Chaucer, to the bitter invectives of Wycliffe and the Lollards, and to the more moderate complaints of the secular clergy—they had become a perfect byeword for immorality, buffoonery, and monstrous lying. But probably in no body of men were there such great and complete contrasts as in the Friars. While the common rank and file of the begging brethren were in every way contemptible, there were in the bodies to which they belonged men of the highest

[1] Wilkins, *Concil.*, iii. 632-3.

excellence, learning, and power. To condemn the Franciscans, as a body, would be to condemn learning itself. The school which produced Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, and William of Occham, "each unrivalled in his way, and each working with equal ability in opposite directions,"[1] must ever stand high in the literary annals of our race. It is well observed by Dean Milman that the great cause of mischief to the Friars, and, probably, the chief thing which brought them to the degradation which they unquestionably exhibited in the fifteenth century, was the popularity of their profession, and the way in which numbers swarmed into it as the means of obtaining a comfortable subsistence and leading an idle life.[2] There was no qualification of learning, no probation needed. And yet these untrained and unfit brethren easily obtained orders, as the Oxford complaint testifies, and were everywhere intruding themselves into the pulpits and getting almost a monopoly of hearing confessions. No wonder, therefore, if they became "pulpit-bawlers," as Bishop Pecock describes them,[3] or if, in order to maintain their popularity, they imported into their pulpit addresses strange, grotesque, often blasphemous stories.

13. In addition to the parish clergy, and the monks and friars who were in orders, there was another class of clergy to be found in great numbers in England in the fifteenth century, who probably surpassed all those already mentioned in the irregularity of their lives. These were the chantry priests, attached either to cathedrals or parish churches, or ministering in chapels belonging to great houses. The sole office and work of these priests was to say masses for the dead. These men "were not drawn on by the necessities of self-culture either to deeper study of divine truth, or to the lessons which are derived from the

[1] Brewer, *Introduction to Monumenta Franciscana.* The school of the Oxford Franciscans alone produced Richard of Coventry, John Wallis, Thomas Dockyng, Thomas Bungay, Roger Bacon, Archbishop Peccham, Richard Middleton, Duns Scotus, Occham, and Burley. The other orders also had their famous names.

[2] See Milman, *Lat. Christianity,* vi. 363.

[3] Letter to Godhard, Lewis, *Life of Pecock,* p. 25.

obligation to instruct others. . . . Every town contained thus a number of idle men, whose religious duties filled but a small portion of their time, who had no secular responsibilities, and whose standard of moral conduct was formed upon a very low ideal."[1] These men were practically exempt from episcopal control; they had no religious "rule" to direct them. They acted for the most part in some secular capacity for the family to which they were attached, and their way of life was often very scandalous. The number of persons ordained to this sort of clerical life was very great indeed. The ordination lists of the bishops, which may be seen in their registers, often give the names of one, two, or three hundred persons admitted into one or other of the orders of the ministry, and as the members of the religious orders were for the most part laymen, and the parishes of England did not number more than 8000, the great majority of persons ordained must have been ordained for chaplaincies or as chantry priests.[2]

14. The employment of many such persons in secular, and often very unbecoming occupations, must have tended much to degrade the clerical office in the eyes of the laymen. And as regards secular employment, the bishops set the clergy the worst possible example. In spite of the attempts made from time to time to entrust the great offices of State to lay hands, they always reverted to the clergy, and it is hardly too much to say that there was not one of the more distinguished bishops in the Mediæval period who was not employed in some State duties. This was especially the case in the fifteenth century. The defence of this, ventured upon by Bishop Pecock, has been already mentioned, and also the indignant protest of Thomas Gascoigne, a contemporary writer, who gives a long list of prelates of his day, who were immersed in State affairs.[3] It is needless to point out how absolute a bar this secular business must have been to the effectual supervision of a diocese.

15. As to the amount of learning to be found among the clergy, it is difficult to arrive at a satisfactory estimate.

[1] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii. 372. [2] *Ib.*, 366.

[3] Gascoigne, *Dict. Theol.* (ed. Rogers), p. l., see pp. 473-4.

There were many, no doubt, among them, whether parish clergy, chantry priests, or friars in orders, who were grossly ignorant; and some even among the bishops who were so; but, on the other hand, there were many able men, well versed in the knowledge then accessible, and familiar with and capable of using dexterously all the subleties of the schools. The school divinity, with its fine distinctions and definitions, and the curious questions which it raised, was a great sharpener of the intellect and stimulant of thought. Wycliffe could never have made the impression that he did had he not been, as Knighton describes him, "second to none in philosophy, and in the learning of the schools altogether without a rival."[1] Just as Luther did, a century and a half later, he used the bright and polished weapons with which practice in the scholastical divinity had furnished him, for the advancement of the truth; and among the opponents of Wycliffe we find men fully able to contend with him with the same weapons. Pecock's was a mind of remarkable power, and his learning was considerable, and the leading part taken by Robert Hallam, bishop of Salisbury, at the Council of Constance, did credit to the Church of England. It would be wrong, therefore, to stigmatise the fifteenth century in England as a period of ignorance, although there may have been many curates who, as Wycliffe said of the clergy of his day, "kunnen not the ten commandments, ne read their sauter, ne understand a verse of it."[2]

16. There is one other point connected with the clerical character at this period which must have had a great and special influence on the way in which the clergy were regarded by the laity. Simony was almost universal. The papal court had always been notorious for the bribes which it required and accepted, but in the fifteenth century the payment of money for promotion was formed into a regular

[1] "In philosophiâ nulli reputabatur secundus, in scholasticis doctrinis incomparabilis."

[2] Lewis, *Life of Pecock*, p. 23. Nicholas de Clemangis (*De Corrupto Ecclesiæ Statu*) is equally strong. He says there were many clergy who could not read, who understood Latin no more than they did Arabic, and who were not able to distinguish A from B. Quoted by Lewis, *Life of Pecock*, p. 24.

system. In spite of the prohibitory laws, not only sees, but benefices also, were openly bought by English clergy of the Pope, the general form being to purchase what was called an *expectative*, that is, the right of succeeding to the benefice at the next vacancy. But besides this, Boniface IX. or John XXII. is credited with having introduced the system of Annates, which was an arbitrary tax fixed by the Pope's collector, being nominally the amount of the first year's income of a benefice, but often much more. This tax had no foundation in English law, and was in fact a simoniacal buying-off of the Pope's opposition.[1] But neither did the purchase of the *Provision*, and then the payment of the *Annates*, exhaust the demands made upon the bishop-elect by the Pope.[2] He had also to purchase five or six bulls, authorising his consecration, his jurisdiction, etc., for all of which great sums were charged. The bishop must thus have appeared to the laymen simply as one who had bought an appointment, and the lay patron, often robbed of his patronage by the Pope's provisions,

[1] By 6 Hen. IV. c. 1, it is complained of as a damnable custom that "no parson, abbot, nor other should have *provision* of any archbishopric or bishopric which shall be void, till that he hath compounded with the Pope's chamber to pay great and excessive sums of money, as well for the *first-fruits* of the same archbishopric or bishopric, as for other services in the same court, and that the same sum, or the greater part thereof, be paid beforehand; which sums pass the *treble* or the double at least of that that was accustomed of old time to be paid to the same chamber, and otherwise by the occasion of such provisions." Mr. Stubbs says that the claim to first-fruits of bishoprics and other benefices was first made by Alexander IV. in 1266 for five years—then by Clement V. in 1306 for two years. John XXII. claimed it throughout Christendom for three years. It was resisted at the Council of Constance, but nevertheless was generally acquiesced in. In the debates on it in 1531 we find that £160,000 had thus been paid between 1486 and 1531.—Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii. 337. Gascoigne attributes the commencement of the tax to John XXII.—*Dict. Theol.*, p. 34.

[2] "Nec satis perspicio ut se excusare possint hoc modo promoti a Pontifice quominus in canonum pœnam incurrant, et, tanquam vitio creati, ut veteres loquebantur, dignitatem, honoremque ecclesiasticum amittant, si quis ad priscæ institutionis normam potius quam receptæ consuetudinis hæc exigere velit."—Duarenus, *De Beneficiis*. Quoted, Lewis, *Pecock*, p. 42.

would not be slow to take example by the acts of those in high places, and would refuse to present to the benefices in his gift, unless fittingly bribed. But if the priest had to buy his benefice, on the other hand he could sell the sacraments. Confession and communion, or houseling, were held to be necessary at least once a year for the layman, but he could not get these from the priest without bringing a sufficient offering. This abuse is constantly referred to and forbidden in bishops' constitutions and injunctions, but it flourished notwithstanding, and was an ever-ready topic of reproach against the parish priests.[1] And if the living could not have the sacraments without money, it is certain that the masses which were supposed to benefit the dead were made a regular matter of trade and barter by the priest. Upon this foundation all the vast apparatus of chantries and chantry priests rested, and it was without doubt the most prominent feature in the mediæval religious life of England.

17. And as the clergy were hard exactors from the laity for the means of grace which they were compelled to use, so in the matter of moral discipline they plied a gainful traffic upon them, which was scarcely likely to recommend them to their affections. By a system of discipline at once inquisitorial and flagrantly corrupt and unjust, they continually vexed the lives of their parishioners, in order to extort from them fees and fines. In the Courts Christian or Church courts, to which a large class of cases—those, namely, in which religion was concerned—properly belonged, there had grown up a system of correcting moral delinquencies by fines and money payments which produced the most disastrous consequences. "For the spiritual courts, whilst they imposed spiritual penalties, recognised perfunctory purgations, and accepted pecuniary fines, and thus they really secured the peccant clerk and the immoral layman

[1] Thus, in the satirical poem of "Jack Upland"—

> "I trowe it be thi paroche priest
> Jack, that thou menest,
> That nyl not hosel his parischens
> Til the peny be paid,
> Ne assoilen hem of her synne
> Withouten schrift silver.—*Polit. Poems*, ii. 46.

alike from the due consequences of vice, such as either a stricter discipline or a healthier public opinion would have been likely to impose. . . . The Church courts became centres of corruption, which archbishops, legates, and councils tried to reform and failed, acquiescing in the failure rather than allow the intrusion of the secular power."[1] Readers of Chaucer will not need to be reminded with what feelings this offensive and degrading discipline, which was simply a machinery for extorting money, was regarded by the laity.

18. We may next inquire how far these evils and oppressions were compensated for by the benefits received from the clergy by the laity in the way of instruction and guidance. The only religious service at all obligatory on a layman was the hearing of mass, which might certainly suggest to him devout feelings, but could not much assist in his instruction. But at the time of mass a sermon was sometimes preached. Either the parish priest was a preacher, like the good parson of Chaucer, or some wandering friar had come by and had offered his services. In the thirteenth century Bishop Grosseteste had ordered the clergy of his diocese that every Sunday they should preach a sermon in the vulgar tongue.[2] About forty years afterwards Archbishop Peccham, in his Constitutions at Lambeth, ordered all priests to expound to their parishioners "in the vulgar tongue, without any fantastical affectation of subtlety," the chief points of the faith, and gave a form to assist them in doing so.[3] John Thoresby, Archbishop of York, published in 1357, with the consent of his Convocation, a manual of instruction in alliterative lines, to be taught by the parish priests to the people "openly on Sundays." The translation of the *Speculum* of St. Edmund, the writings of Richard de Hampole, and other early English religious writings, may have served as homilies for the priest unable to compose a sermon for himself. There are English homilies in existence of a very early date. It is probable, indeed, that preaching had fallen into much disuse in the fifteenth cen-

[1] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii. 373.

[2] Grosseteste's Constitutions in the vol. of his Letters (Ed. Luard).

[3] Johnson's *English Canons*, ii. 283.

tury. Archbishop Arundel had discouraged it, fearing the propagation of Lollard doctrines; and Bishop Pecock had defended its disuse by the bishops. Gascoigne's comments on preaching imply that it was rare. He says, "Episcopi quasi nullos ad prædicandum miserunt;" "dabant paucis licentiam."

19. As regards the mass-service, though unintelligible to the lay folk, and though their mere presence was all that was required, there was yet provided for them a means of gaining edification from it by a "Lay-folks' Mass-Book," or English metrical manual. This, which followed along with the mass-service, and provided suitable meditations and prayers in English at each portion of it, must have been of extreme value to unlettered people.[1] But besides this the laity were in possession of numerous religious manuals in English, which gave them simple instruction in the chief points of their faith. These were not provided formally by the Church, but were due to the efforts of individuals, some of them connected with religious orders, others not. Towards the end of the thirteenth century Robert de Brune, a canon of Sempringham, wrote an English version of the Norman-French poem called "Manuel des Pechiez," which contains much valuable instruction. In the earlier part of the fourteenth century we have two important religious and moral English poems—the "Prick of Conscience," by a Yorkshire hermit, a layman, Richard Rolle of Hampole; and the "Remorse of Conscience" (Ayenbite of Inwyt), in the Kentish dialect, by Dan Michel of Northgate.

20. In the latter part of this century England was full of the striking tracts of Wycliffe and his followers; but these were under the severe censure of the Church, and would be carefully avoided by the orthodox layman. Not so, however, was the poem of the "Visions of Piers Plowman," by William Langland, one of the most important and valuable compositions of the Middle Age in England. William Langland was no foe to the Church; he doubted not her power nor her divine mission; but the miserable traffick-

[1] The "Lay-folks' Mass-book" has been edited, with a profusion of erudition, and a vast mass of valuable information as to mediæval religion, by Canon Simmons for the E. E. T. Society.

ing of religious quacks excited his soul to wrath, and the grievously immoral and rotten state of society touched him to the quick. It was as a moral censor that he wrote, not as a religious objector. He speaks the language of the enlightened conscience, and condemns the radically corrupt state of religion, because of the corrupt evidences of it apparent on every day. "He shows himself to us," says his accomplished editor, "as a man of simple, noble, and pure faith; strong in saving common-sense, full of love for his fellows, the friend of the poor, the adviser of the rich; with strong views on the duties of a king towards his subjects, together with a deep feeling of reverence towards the kingly character; unprejudiced, and even willing to be taught." [1]

21. There are many other early English poems of about this period which show a simple faith in and devotion to the Saviour, and prove that, together with the great abuses and corruptions which prevailed, there was much genuine and earnest religious feeling to be found. As to the knowledge of Scripture possessed by laymen, though until the era of Wycliffe but little had been translated into the vernacular,[2] there were yet current rhyming manuals of the facts of Scripture, which must have taught the people much of its contents. The earliest of these was Bishop Grosseteste's "Castel of Love," written in Norman-French, but Anglicised in several dialects; the "Story of Genesis and Exodus," in English of the thirteenth century; and in the fourteenth, "Alliterative Poems," of which poem its learned editor says—"These poems seem to have been written for the purpose of enforcing by line upon line and precept upon precept resignation to the will of God; purity of life as manifested in thought, word, and deed; obedience to the divine command, and patience under affliction." [3] The devout teaching in Chaucer's "Parson's Tale" is probably familiar to most readers. From all this it may perhaps be

[1] Preface to *Piers Plowman*, by Rev. W. W. Skeat, p. xxxviii.

[2] Some portions, as the Psalms and parts of Isaiah, were translated by Richard de Hampole. There were also, no doubt, other portions to be found in English.

[3] Dr. Morris's Preface to *Alliterative Poems*, p. ix. E. E. T. S.

inferred that the religious tone among the laity in the Middle Ages of England was both superior to that which is found among the clergy, and but little due to clerical teaching. There was not to the layman the mischievous influence of an enforced celibacy, nor of a trafficking in holy things, nor of a divided allegiance between the Pope and the State. The layman reverenced the Pope as in his view the spiritual head of the Church, but the intrusions of his jurisdiction into the land he was ever prepared stoutly to resist. He paid his contribution to Peter's Pence, which did not fall heavily upon him,[1] but any further exactions, attempted by the Pope's collector, he was usually able successfully to baffle.

22. Some of the less known and less regular sources of instruction open to the layman in the Middle Ages have been spoken of; but probably one of the chief aids to the devout lay-churchman in the fifteenth century was the book called *The Primer*. This was a book containing, partly in English and partly in Latin, but sometimes, it would seem, entirely in English, "The Hours of Our Lady;" Evensong and Compline; The Seven Penitential Psalms; The Fifteen Psalms relating to the Seven Deadly Sins; The Litany; The Placebo and Dirge;[2] The Psalms of Commendation; Pater Noster; Ave Maria; Creed; The Ten Commandments; The Seven Deadly Sins. Such a manual, which was founded on shorter manuals of older date, would be of the greatest assistance for private devotions.

23. But the layman of the fifteenth century was not allowed by the clergy to be contented with practising quietly his own devotions, and frequenting the ordinary church services. He was required to testify his devotion by more conspicuous acts, viz. by going on some pilgrimage, and paying his vows before some famous image. Archbishop

[1] The composition for this tax from the whole kingdom was £201: 9s. In 1306, Clement V. endeavoured to raise it by levying an actual penny from every household, but this was resisted.—Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii. 305.

[2] That is, the Vespers and Matins, which formed the office for the dead—the first anthem at Vespers beginning with *Placebo*, the first at Matins beginning with *Dirige*.—Procter's *Prayer-Book*, p. 423.

Arundel, at the trial of Oldcastle, declared, "Holy Church hath determined that it is needful for a Christian man to go a pilgrimage to holy places, and there especially to worship holy relics of saints, apostles, martyrs, confessors, and all saints approved by the Church of Rome." [1] The favourite pilgrimages in England were those to our Lady of Walsingham, the rood at the north door of St. Paul's,[2] and St. Thomas of Canterbury.

24. The Lollards vehemently objected to these pilgrimages, but they are defended with much skill and vigour by Bishop Pecock, whose argument probably represents what was generally urged by the clergy of his day in support of this practice, so lucrative to many of them. The bishop argues, "It is full reasonable and full worthy that rememorative visible signs be had of all those now spoken things. For without rememorative signs of a thing, the remembrance of that thing or things must needs be the feebler, and therefore, since the body or bones or other relics of any person is a full nigh rememorative sign of the same person, it is full reasonable and full worthy that where the body and bones or any relic of a saint may be had, that it be set up in a common place where people may have devout access for to make the said remembrance. And as it is not reasonable that such body and bones should be left in the bare field, therefore it is full reasonable and worthy for to build over those bodies and bones and other relics, chapels or churches, and to build beside them altars and choirs, that the office of praising God and of praying to God and saints be better done. And in a country where no relic of a saint is to be found, that an image of him be made and set up, and a chapel or church builded; and because this is the case with Christ and his mother Mary, it is reasonable that images of Christ crucified and of his mother be made. And if it can be proved (as the bishop asserts that it can) that at some of these images special

[1] *Fascic. Zizan.*, p. 442.

[2] "It is vain waste and idle for to trot to Wasingham rather than to each other place in which an image of Mary is; and to the rode at the north dore at London, rather than to each other roode in whatever place it be."—*Repressor*, i. 194.

miracles are worked, then it is reasonable that men should go on pilgrimage specially to those places which God chooses. They do not go to worship the image, but to worship God working in and by the image. This is not idolatry. For idolatry is never done save when a man taketh a creature for his God and worshippeth that creature ; but so doeth no man with any image now in Christendom, after that the man is come to years of discretion, and is passed childhood, and is not a natural fool." [1]

25. Closely connected with the subject of pilgrimage and image-worship is that of indulgences. These were always granted as a boon to the pilgrims, but what was the moral effect of obtaining them? Supposing that we accept the notion that the indulgence is simply a commutation of penance, the paying of a sum of money or performing an act such as a pilgrimage, instead of going through so many days' penance for sins repented of and confessed. Something on this ground might be urged in its favour. It is clear, however, that the indulgence was practically worked as something much more than this. It was held out as giving an actual pardon for sins neither repented of nor confessed, and an actual remission and freeing from the pains of purgatory. As such, whether granted by English prelates, or sold by the Pope's trafficking agents, it could have no other than an absolutely demoralising effect, and one of grievous mischief to the religious life.[2]

26. It may perhaps be thought that the mischiefs done to the laity by the mediæval clergy in forcing them to make pilgrimages, vexing them with a futile discipline, and deluding them with indulgences, are yet but small in comparison with the injury done to them by the way in which the doctrines of the Christian religion had been

[1] "Repressor of over much Blaming the Clergy," vol. i. pp. 148, 182.

[2] Gascoigne is exceedingly severe on the retailing of Indulgences. He says, "Isti qui concedunt literas indulgenciarum discurrunt per regiones, et dant aliquando literam pro duobus denariis, aliquando pro bono haustu vini vel serevisiæ, aliquando pro lusu ad pilam si vincantur, aliquando pro actu meretricio, aliquando pro amore carnali."—*Dict. Theol.* (ed. Rogers), p. 123.

manipulated to serve clerical profit and power. By laying down the *necessity* of auricular confession; by inventing the scholastic theory, that in the consecrated Eucharist bread and wine no longer remain, save in their accidents; by devising the fable of purgatory—the clergy had provided themselves with terrible weapons, against which the laity could but feebly contend. All these doctrines, if accepted, had a direct tendency to uphold the clergy in their position of wealth and power. They had a direct tendency to humiliate and abase the laity before them, and the acceptance or non-acceptance of them was not a matter of choice. They were forced upon every man to hold, or at least to profess, by the stake and the flame. Either a man's life must be shamed and degraded by a scandalous retractation, or his body must be burned in agonies if he ventured to differ from these cherished assumptions of the clergy. The records of the fifteenth century are a dreadful commentary on the practical results of the Mediæval Church.

27. The amount of wealth possessed by the clergy may perhaps be fairly estimated by the amount of their contribution to the taxation of the country. This was nearly one-third of the whole taxation of the nation.[1] And it must be remembered that after the time of Edward I. the clergy exercised, without much interference from the lay power, the sole right of taxing themselves, and although their contributions generally somewhat exceeded those of the laity in proportion, they would nevertheless be estimated on a fair basis of property value. Assuming, therefore, the wealth of the clergy and the religious houses to bear this proportion to that of the laity, it must also be remembered that the clergy had a majority in the House of Lords, houses of legislature of their own in the Convocations, vast immunities conceded by the State, a system of judicature of their own, and a corporate cohesion, which was of the utmost value for giving them power. They were thus by far the most powerful body in the State, and in fact there was no other body which could in any way contest the palm of influence with them. And yet, though supported by this elaborate system of props and defences, the

[1] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, iii. 365.

power of the clergy began in the fifteenth century to totter, because by its misuse the conscience of the nation had been outraged.

28. The first rude blow to the mass of superstition and ignorance which had gradually accumulated in the Church came from the hand of Erasmus, the acute scholar of Rotterdam.[1] Educated among monks and canons, having had experience of no less than four "religious" houses, Erasmus had yet learned early in life utterly to despise the system. He was at Oxford with Colet, Grocyn, Linacre, and More, at the end of the fifteenth century, and it is to the impressions made upon him at this period and by these friends, that we must attribute the special bent which his genius received. With an intellect of wonderful keenness, a vast and comprehensive knowledge, Erasmus was yet deficient in moral earnestness; and he would probably have been contented to go through life, like Rabelais, laughing at the follies of the monks, but doing nothing to correct them, had it not been for the influence of his friend Colet. To Colet's grave expostulations is to be attributed the publication in 1504 of the *Enchiridion Militis Christiani*, which its author declares was written not to display either genius or eloquence, but simply for this,—to counteract the vulgar error of those who think that religion consists in ceremonies and in more than Jewish observances, while they neglect what really belongs to piety.[2] In this book Erasmus deals his blows with tremendous force against many of the popular superstitions of the day—relic-hunting, pilgrimages, saint-worship. The attack is repeated in his preface to the *Dialogues of Lucian* (1506), where he ridicules the men who think that they "lay Christ under a lasting obligation by inventing fables about some saint." The satirical power thus displayed was seen in its fullest and most withering force in the *Encomium Moriæ*, and the *Colloquies*. With the constructive part of the work of Erasmus we are not here concerned.[3] John Colet was a man of a different spirit from his friend. Impressed with a feeling of bitter sadness for the moral debasement around

[1] Born at Rotterdam, October 28, 1467. [2] Erasm. *Ep.* 102.
[3] See *Student's Eng. Ch. History* (Second Period), Chap. I.

him, his first great effort was to reawaken attention to Scripture, which, since the days of Wycliffe, had been held in ill repute. By his lectures at Oxford on St. Paul, and afterwards at his cathedral, when he became Dean of St. Paul's in 1505, Colet attracted general attention, and gave an impetus to the study of the sacred writings. He was introduced to the court as a preacher by Warham, and defended by him when accused of heresy. Gradually he drew round him a band of earnest men, and became a centre of considerable influence. Thus, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, there were not wanting in England indications of the presence of new powers and life in the Church; but to point out how these acted upon the whole body is beyond the limits of this work, and will be found fully treated in the History of the Second Period.

APPENDIX A.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE ELECTION OF BISHOPS IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Abridged from Professor Stubbs's *Constitutional History*, vols. i. and iii.

"In the earliest days the Kings of Northumbria and Kent deliberated on the election to Canterbury as a matter of international interest; and in A.D. 1051, Edward the Confessor summarily sets aside the choice of the monks. Dunstan was appointed 'ex respectu divino et sapientum consilio.' Edward the Confessor appointed Archbishop Robert in a Witenagemot at London, and nominated Spearhafoc to London at the same time. Yet nothing can be more certain than that in many cases the clergy, and even the people of the dioceses, were consulted. Alcuin writes to the priests of York urging them to make a right election. The Chapter of St. Paul's could exhibit a bull of Pope Agatho conferring on them the exclusive right. A bishop of Lichfield, in the ninth century, declares himself elected by the whole church of the province; and Helmstan of Winchester, in A.D. 839, mentions the pope, the king, the church of Winchester, and all the bishops, optimates, and nation of the West Saxons as joining in his appointment. It is probable that under the heptarchic kings the action of the churches was comparatively free in this respect, and that the restriction was a result of the growth of royal power; but that like all other ecclesiastical business the appointment of bishops was a matter of arrangement between the parties concerned; the election by the clergy was the rule in quiet times and for the less important sees; the nomination by the king in the Witenagemot was frequent in the case of the archiepiscopal and greater sees; the

consent of the national assembly to the admission of a new member to their body being in all cases implied, on behalf of the most important element in it, by the act of consecration performed by the comprovincial bishops. . . . The struggle between Henry I. and Anselm on the question of investiture terminated in a compromise, which placed the election in the hands of the chapters of the cathedrals, the consecration in that of the metropolitan and comprovincial bishops, and the bestowal of temporal estates and authority in the hands of the king. Stephen, at his accession, confirmed to the churches the right of canonical election. Henry II. and Richard observed the form; and John, shortly before he granted the Great Charter, issued as a bribe to the bishops a shorter charter confirming the right of free election, subject to the royal license and approval, neither of which was to be withheld without just cause. The charter of John may be regarded as the fullest and final recognition of the canonical right which had been maintained as the common law of the Church ever since the Conquest, which had been ostensibly respected since the days of Henry I., and which the Crown, however often it evaded it, did not henceforth attempt to override. The earlier practice recorded in the Constitutions of Clarendon, according to which the election was made in the Curia Regis in a national council, or in the royal chapel before the justiciar—a relic perhaps of nominating the prelates in the Witenagemot—was superseded by this enactment. The election took place in the chapter-house of the cathedral, and the king's wishes were signified by letter or message, not as before by direct dictation. When the elected prelate had obtained the royal assent to his promotion, the election was examined and confirmed by the Metropolitan, and the ceremony of consecration completed the spiritual character of the bishop. On his confirmation the elected prelate received the spiritualties of his See, the right of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in his diocese, which, during the vacancy, had been in the hands of the archbishop or the chapter; and at his consecration, he made a profession of obedience to the archbishop and the metropolitan church. From the Crown, before or after consecration, he received the temporalties of his See, and thereupon made to the king a promise of fealty, answering to the homage and fealty of a temporal lord. It was not till the thirteenth century that the popes began to interfere directly in the appointments of the suffragan sees; over the metropolitans they had long before attempted to exercise a

controlling influence in two ways—by the gift of the pall, and by the appointment of legations. . . . The papal interference in the appointment of suffragans might be justified either by supposing the confirmation of an undisputed election to be needed, or by the judicial character of the Apostolic See in cases of dispute or appeal. If we set aside the instances of papal interference which belong to the missionary stage of Anglo-Saxon Church history, the first cases in which direct recourse to Rome was adopted for the appointment of bishops were those of Giso of Wells, and Walter of Hereford. These two prelates having doubts about the canonical competency of Archbishop Stigand, went to Nicolas II., in 1061 and received consecration at his hands. In this case the actual nomination had been made at home, and the question at issue was one which might fairly be referred to the arbitration of the Apostolic See. . . . As soon as the clergy under Stephen had obtained a real voice in the election of bishops, questions were raised which had the effect of referring numberless cases to the determination of the Pope as supreme judge. The King's right of licensing and of assenting or of withholding assent to the election, was backed up by his power of influencing the electors. In every chapter he had a party who would vote for his nominee, if he cared to press one upon them; the shadowy freedom of election left room for other competition besides; the overt exercise of such royal influence, the frequent suspicion of simony, and the various methods of election—by inspiration, by compromise, or by scrutiny, were fruitful in occasions for appeal. . . . At the end, however, of the twelfth century the relations of the three parties were sufficiently well ascertained. The royal license and assent were indispensable. The elective right of the chapters and the archiepiscopal confirmation were formally admitted, and the power of the Pope to determine all causes which arose upon disputed questions was too strongly founded in practice to be controverted. This power was, however, in the case of the suffragans an appellate jurisdiction only. It was the archbishops alone who required papal confirmation and recognition by the gift of the pall; nor, although Pascal II. had claimed a right to take cognisance of and to confirm all elections, was the metropolitan authority of Canterbury and York as yet overruled. The claim of the bishops to take part in the election of the archbishops, which was occasionally enforced during the twelfth century, was rejected by Innocent III., and was never raised afterwards. . . . The free-

dom of election promised by John resulted in a freedom of litigation, and little more. The attempts of Henry III. to influence the chapters were undignified and unsuccessful. His candidates were seldom chosen; the Pope had a plentiful harvest of appeals. Between 1215 and 1264 there were not fewer than thirty disputed elections carried to Rome for decision. . . . Under Edward I. there were only twelve cases of the kind; yet, although the rarity of the appeals shows the king to have become stronger, they were so managed by the Popes as to increase their own influence, and the result was the extinction, for more than a century, of the elective right of the chapters. . . . From the beginning of the fourteenth century the Pope's interference in the appointment of bishops takes a new form, and he assumes the patronage as well as the appellate jurisdiction. This was done by the application to the episcopate of the rights of provision and reservation, which had been exercised long before in the case of the lower preferments. . . . By the Statute of Provisors, 1351, it was enacted that all persons receiving papal provisions should be liable to imprisonment, and that all the preferments to which the Pope nominated should be forfeit for that turn to the King. But even this bold measure, in which the good sense of the Parliament condemned the proceedings of the Pope, was turned by royal manipulation to the advantage of the Crown alone. A system was devised which saved the dignity of all parties. When a See became vacant, the King sent to the chapter his license to elect, accompanied or followed by a letter nominating the person whom he would accept if elected. He also, by letter to the Pope, requested that the same person might be appointed by papal provision. With equal complaisance the Popes provided and the chapters elected. The Pope retained, however, the nomination to Sees vacant by translation, which vacancies he took care to multiply. This arrangement was very displeasing to the country, for the question of patronage, in other cases besides bishoprics, was becoming complicated to an extreme degree. . . . Henry V., among the other pious acts by which he earned the support of the clergy, restored the right of election to the chapters, the Parliament also agreeing that the confirmation of the election should be performed as it had been of old by the Metropolitans. For two or three years the whole of the long-disused process was revived, and the Church was free. But Martin V., when he found himself seated firmly on his throne, was not content to wield less power than

his predecessors had claimed. He provided thirteen bishops in two years, and threatened to suspend Chichele's legation, because he was unable to procure the repeal of the restraining statutes. . . . Under Henry VII. and Henry VIII. the royal nominees were invariably chosen ; the Popes had other objects in view than the influencing of the national churches, and the end of their domination was at hand. The clergy, too, were unable to stand alone against royal and papal pressure, and placed themselves at the disposal of the Government. The Government was ready to use them, and paid for their service by promotion."

APPENDIX B.

CONSTITUTIONS OF CANTERBURY AND YORK: FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES.

[The chief Constitutions of the Metropolitans of the two Provinces, not noticed in the Text, or in Notes and Illustrations, are here given.]

Constitutions of Archbishop Winchelsea, published at Merton, 1305.

1 and 2 Regulate the payment of tithes.

3 Ordains that the second best animal belonging to a man go to the church at his death as a mortuary fee.

4. List of ornaments *to be found by the parishioners.*—A Legend, an Antiphoner, a Grail, a Psalter, a Troper, an Ordinal, a Missal, a Manual, a Chalice, the principal Mass-vestment with Chasuble, a Dalmatic, a Tunic, a Choral Cope and its appendages, a Frontal for the Altar, 3 Towels, 3 Surplices, 1 Rochet, a Cross for Processions, a Cross for the dead, a Censer, a Lantern, a Hand-Bell, a Pyx, a decent veil for Lent, Banners for the Rogations, Bells with ropes, a Bier for the dead, a Vessel for holy water, an Osculatory, a Candlestick, a Font with lock and key, the Images of the Church, the chief Image in the chancel; the enclosure of the Churchyard, the repair of the body of the Church within and without, the images, the glass windows, the repair of books and vestments. The rectors and vicars are to repair all the rest, the chancel and whatever is here omitted, or they to whom it belongs, at their own cost.

Canon 5 regulates the behaviour of Chantry priests (Stipendiary) towards the Incumbents of the Churches, and forbids them to hear confessions.

Canon 6 gives minute directions as to Tithes.

Constitutions of Archbishop Reynolds, published at Oxford, 1322.

1. None to be ordained without canonical examination. Simoniacs, manslayers, excommunicates, usurers, sacrilegious persons, incendiaries, falsaries, those under canonical impediment, to be incapable of orders. Those who have been ordained in Ireland, Wales, Scotland, or elsewhere, to exhibit letters commendatory before being allowed to officiate. Monks to be ordained by the bishop of the diocese.

2. Children to be taken to the bishop for confirmation "as soon as may be after baptism." On the third day afterwards to be taken to the Church, that their foreheads may be washed by the priest to remove the holy oil, and the cloths which were bound round their heads burnt. No child to be held at confirmation by its father or mother, stepfather or stepmother. Holding a child at confirmation establishes spiritual affinity.

3. Priests to exhort the people to receive extreme unction, which may be repeated every year.

4. The Eucharist to be kept in a pyx of ivory or silver, not reserved above seven days; to be carried to the sick with due reverence; linen cloths and ornaments of the altar to be decent; two suits of priest's vestments to be provided, those who tend the altar to wear surplices.

5. The priest to be very careful in saying mass, "nor through affectation to make the office nauseous to the hearers." The priest not to celebrate mass till he hath finished Matins, Prime, and Undern (Tierce); all clerks to wear surplices; two candles to be lighted at mass. Priests, if they have committed mortal sin, to make special confession. The general confession only purges venial sins.

6. Archdeacons in their visitations to inspect the ornaments of the Church, and to provide that repairs be executed.

7. Matrimony to be celebrated in the face of the Church. Publication of banns to be made on three Lord's days preceding.

8 Regulates confession; and

9 Sentences any priest who betrays confession to degradation.

10. Priests to be appointed in each deanery to hear the confessions of the clergy. Hermits, friars, monks, not to admit strangers to penance.

Constitutions of Archbishop Mepham, published at St. Paul's, London, 1328.

Some extracts from these are given, p. 401.

Constitutions of Archbishop Stratford, published London, 1342. (Called also Extravagants or Addenda.)

1. Priests not to celebrate mass in private oratories.

2. Clerks not to be charged above twelvepence for certificates of institution, and not above sixpence for letters of orders.

3. Only moderate fees to be charged for induction, *i.e.* fortypence to the archdeacon ; his official (if he act) two shillings.

4. "Religious" who have benefices to give a portion of the revenues thereof to the poor.

5. "Religious" owning property in a parish to be subject to the burden of repairing the Parish Church equally with the parishioners.

6. In proving wills no fees to be taken by the bishop. Sixpence to be allowed for making certificates if the goods do not exceed thirty shillings, and ten onward in proportion.

7. In view of the great abuses practised by archdeacons, who demand procurations without visiting churches, it is ordered that no procuration be paid unless the church be properly visited ; that not more than one procuration be received in a day. Victuals supplied may be reckoned as procuration. Fines inflicted for lack of repair to be used for the purposes of the fabric.

8. Consistories and courts ecclesiastical only to be summoned in the chief places of the diocese, where provisions may be easily had.

9. Inasmuch as the clergy are greatly vexed by the multitude of apparitors who make demands of them, it is ordained that each bishop have only one riding apparitor, and each archdeacon one foot apparitor, who shall only have right of lodging with the clergy for one night.

10. Penance for grievous sin not to be commuted for money "where the offender hath relapsed more than twice." Excessive corporal punishment not to be used in order to frighten men into compounding.

11. Persons accused of crimes to be allowed to make their purgation in the deanery where they are accused.

12. A fee of one penny, and no more, to be charged by the

archdeacon for entering the name of a clergyman in the roll of the clergy.

13. Clerks obtaining by false representations presentations from the Crown to benefices which are not vacant, and prosecuting the bishops in secular courts for not admitting them, to be excommunicated.

14. Those who legally gain the right of patronage in the king's courts to be allowed by the ordinary to present.

ARCHBISHOP STRATFORD'S CONSTITUTIONS, PUBLISHED A.D. 1343.

1. Offenders against the laws to be denounced publicly as excommunicate.

2. "The prevailing excesses of the clergy as to tonsure, garments, and trappings, give abominable scandal to the people, because such as have dignities, parsonages, honourable prebends, and benefices with cure, and even men in holy orders, scorn the tonsure (which is the mark of perfection and of the heavenly kingdom), and distinguish themselves with hair hanging down to their shoulders in an effeminate manner; and apparel themselves like soldiers rather than clerks, with an upper coat short and tight, with long hanging sleeves, and not covering the elbows, their hair curled and powdered, and caps with tippets (? tassels) of a wonderful length, with long beards, and rings on their fingers, girt with girdles exceeding large and costly, having purses enamelled with figures and various sculptures gilt, hanging, with knives like swords in open view; their shoes chequered with red and green, exceeding long and variously pinked; with cruppers to their saddles, and baubles like horns hanging down on the necks of their horses, and cloaks furred on the edges, contrary to canonical sanctions, so that there is no distinction between clerks and laics, which renders them unworthy of the privilege of their order; we therefore, to obviate these miscarriages as well of the masters and scholars within the universities of our province, as of those without, with the approbation of this sacred synod, do ordain and charge that all beneficed men, those especially in holy orders in our province, have their tonsure as comports with the state of clergymen, and if any of them do exceed by going in a conspicuously short and close upper garment, with long or unreasonably wide sleeves, not covering the elbow, but hanging down, with hair unclipped, long beards, with rings on their fingers in public (excepting those of honour and dignity), or exceed in any particular before expressed, they

shall incur penalties as follows. . . . Yet by this constitution we intend not to abridge clerks of open-wide surcoats, called table-coats, with fitting sleeves to be used at seasonable times and places, nor of short close garments while they are travelling in the country at their own discretion. But because bishops cannot with a good face reprehend others, if they do not reform themselves and their domestics in this respect, we ordain that the bishops of this province observe a decorum in their tonsure, habits, and other points before mentioned, and cause it to be observed by such clerks as dwell with them."

3 Regulates the farming of benefices.

4 and 5. Tithes.

6 Prohibits laymen from taking away what had been offered in church.

7 and 8 Regulate the execution of wills.

9 Forbids estates to be disposed of while the giver is alive.

10 Forbids watching by the dead.

11 Forbids priests to marry those that do not belong to their parish.

12 Is directed against those who obstruct the process of ecclesiastical courts.

13 Forbids secular officers to release excommunicates from prison.

14 and 15 Forbid laymen to encroach on the goods of the church.

16 Forbids malicious prosecutions.

Archbishop Islep's Constitutions, 1351, touching the Imprisonment of Clerks.

Complaint having been made that the secular judges seized and tried clerks, and even condemned them to death, it was answered that the imprisonment of clerks by their ordinaries was a mere pretence ; that clerks were "deliciously fed in the prison intended for a punishment ; that this was turned into a refreshment and delicious solace ; that they were pampered in their vices by ease and such excitements, and make their escape when they will out of custody." It was therefore ordained that all clerks taken by their ordinaries "be closely imprisoned with all proper care and expedition, according to the quality of the persons and heinousness of their crimes, that they may not to the scandal of the Church return to their former way of life from an imprisonment intended as a punishment. And if any

clerks so delivered are notoriously infamous malefactors, or guilty by their own confession of felonies or other grievous crimes, and so publicly defamed that they cannot deny that the crimes were committed by them, or that their enlargement would bring manifest scandal to the Church and her liberty, or to the tranquillity of the kingdom ; that then every Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday they be allowed once a day only bread and water of affliction ; on other days bread and small beer ; but on the Lord's Day, bread, beer, and pulse for the honour and eminence of that day ; (and for others) we will that such caution be used that there be no proceedings made towards their purgation in a judicial manner till diligent inquiry be first made concerning their way of life, reputation, etc., without giving any warning of this inquiry to their acquaintance or friends."

Archbishop Islep's Constitution, a.d. 1359.

" Though it be provided by sanctions of law and canon that all Lord's days be venerably observed from eve to eve, so that neither markets, negotiations, nor courts public or private, ecclesiastical or secular, be kept, or any country work done on those days, that so every faithful man remembering his creation may then at least go to his parish church, ask pardon for his offences, supply his omissions and commissions for the whole week, honour the divine mysteries, learn and keep the commandments of the Church there expounded, and earnestly pour out prayers to God in the churches that are consecrated from above for places of prayer, not only for themselves, but for every degree of men, whether of the secular or ecclesiastical part, laying aside all worldly care ; yet we are clearly informed that a detestable perverseness has prevailed, insomuch that in many places markets, unlawful meetings of men who neglect their churches, various tumults and other occasions of evil, are committed, revels and drunkenness and many other dishonest things are practised, and the worship of God and the saints ceaseth by reason of the absence of the faithful people ; the sacred mysteries are not had in due veneration, and the mutual support of men in praying is withdrawn . . . wherefore we strictly command you, our brother (the Bishop of London), that you without delay canonically admonish and effectually persuade in virtue of obedience those of your subjects whom you shall find culpable in the premisses, that they do wholly abstain from markets, courts, and the other unlawful practices above described, on the

Lord's days for the future; and that such of them as are come to years of discretion do go to their parish churches, to do, hear, and receive what the duty of the day requires of them; and that ye restrain all whatsoever that transgress and rebel in this respect both in general and particular, with Church censures according to the canon. And that you do further enjoin your flock that they do in their prayers at church most devoutly recommend the king, the noblemen of the kingdom, and all others whatsoever that attend him in his expedition, to the Lord most high, the King of kings, and make two customary processions about their churches and churchyards every week for them and for the peace of the kingdom."

Archbishop Islep's Constitution, A.D. 1362.

"We are certainly informed by common fame and experience that modern priests, through covetousness and love of ease, not content with reasonable salaries, demand excessive pay for their labour, and receive it; and do so despise labour and study pleasure that they wholly refuse to serve as parish priests in churches or chapels, or to attend the cure of souls, though fitting salaries are offered them, that they may live in an idle manner by celebrating annals for the quick and dead; and so parish churches and chapels remain unserved, destitute of parochial chaplains, and even proper curates, to the grievous danger of souls; and the said priests, pampered with excessive salaries, discharge their intemperance in vomit and lust, grow wild, and drown themselves in the abyss of vice, to the great scandal of ecclesiastics and the evil example of laymen: We, therefore, desiring a quick cure of this plague, do, with the advice and consent of our brethren, enact and ordain that all unbeneficed chaplains, especially such as are qualified for parochial churches and chapels and the cure of souls, be bound to officiate and attend them at the moderate salaries mentioned below, postponing all private and peculiar services of any persons whatsoever when required by the diocesan or any ordinary judge competent in this respect. And if they neglect to comply for twenty days, let them know, unless there be a lawful impediment, that they are thereby to incur suspension from office. And we enact and ordain that chaplains and they who celebrate annals, and all who do not attend the cure of souls, be content with five marks, but such as officiate in parish churches and the cure of souls thereto belonging, with six marks for their annual stipends,

unless the diocesan, in regard to the largeness of the parish, or for some other lawful cause, do otherwise in his discretion determine." And no priest is to be received into a diocese unless he show commendatory letters from the bishop of the last diocese where he officiated.

[Similar provisions, with some variations, are repeated in subsequent Constitutions of this archbishop, both as to salaries and obligations of priests and the observance of Sundays and holidays.]

Archbishop Langham's Constitutions, 1367.

"2. Approving and promoting what was set on foot with a regard to the health of souls and bodies, that is the prohibition of *scotales* and other drinking bouts, we charge rectors, vicars, and other parish chaplains that they by frequent exhortations earnestly persuade their parishioners that they do not rashly violate this prohibition, or else that they denounce such as they find culpable in this respect, suspending them from entering the church and from participation in the sacrament, till, setting aside other penalties, they go to our penitentiary humbly to receive whatever we shall enjoin as a penance for such transgression. When a multitude of men, exceeding ten in number, stay long in the same house for drinking's sake, we declare these to be common drinking bouts. But we mean not to comprehend travellers and strangers, and such as meet, though in taverns, at fairs and markets, under this prohibition. Detesting these common drinking bouts, which by a change of name they call charity *scotales*, we charge that the authors of such, and they who meet at them, be publicly excommunicated till they have made competent satisfaction.

"3. Let none presume to celebrate mass twice a day unless on the day of the Nativity or Resurrection of the Lord, or when one has a corpse to bury, and then let not the celebrator drink the washings of his fingers and the cup."

Archbishop Sudbury's Constitutions, 1378.

1. Chantry priests to receive seven marks or their diet and three marks, and parish priests eight marks or diet and four marks. 3. Women to confess in a public place, where they can be seen but not heard, and without the veil. 4. Confessions to be made thrice in the year, and men to be enjoined to communi-

cate as often, viz. Easter, Pentecost, and Christmas. Abstinence to be practised previously. Confession and communion, at least at Easter, imperative.

Constitution of Archbishop Courtney, 1391,

Enjoins that all who are presented to benefices should make corporal oaths that they have not given or promised anything to the presenter or any other person, nor undertaken to resign or exchange their benefices, and that in case of exchange no proxies be allowed without the presence of the principals; and that non-residents be called to do their duty, and simoniacal possessors of churches be censured, and that "the accursed partakers with Gehazi and Simon, the "choppe-churches," who chiefly are in London, be in general admonished to desist from such procurings, changings, and trickings made in their conventicles and simoniacal assemblies for the future;" and all bargains made are to be declared null, and the makers of them enjoined penance, and the wicked merchants of the Lord's inheritance be struck with the sword of ecclesiastical censure, especially such of them as are in orders.

[For a notice of Archbishop Arundel's Constitutions against Lollards (A.D. 1408) see page 460.]

Archbishop Chichele's Constitutions, 1415.

1 Decrees that special days be kept in honour of St. George the martyr, St. David and St. Chad, bishops, and St. Winifred, virgin and martyr.

2. That married and bigamous clerks be not admitted to any spiritual jurisdiction or ecclesiastical office.

A.D. 1416.

1 Orders diligent search to be made for those suspected of heresy, and process to be taken against them.

2. That the feast of St. John of Beverley be observed.

A.D. 1430

Condemns the using of the "auncell" weight by merchants in their purchases from producers.

[This appears to have been a method of weighing by holding the beam of the balance on the finger, and might easily give opportunity for fraud in dexterous hands.]

A.D. 1434

Gives the form for the general excommunication to be pronounced in parish churches "at least on three Lord's days in the year, that is, on the first Lord's day in Lent, the first Lord's day after Trinity, the first Lord's day in Advent, as follows:—

"First they be accursed that presume to take away or deprive any church of the right that belongeth thereto, or else against right to destroy, break, or trouble the liberties of the church. And also those that purchase any manner of letters from any temporal court, to let any process of spiritual judges, in such cases as belong to spiritual courts; and all those that with people and noise come to spiritual courts, and put the judges or parties that there plead in fear; or else, forasmuch as the parties sue in spiritual court such causes as belong to spiritual courts, make or procure any of the said parties, advocates, proctors, or other ministers of spiritual courts, to be indited or arrested, or any wise be vexed. Also they that presume to destroy and trouble the ease and tranquillity of the king and his realm of England, and those that wrongfully withhold any right that belongeth to the king. Also all those that wittingly bear false witness or procure false witness to be borne, or else wittingly bring forth in judgment false witness to let right matrimony, or procure disheriting of any person. Also, all those that of malice put any crime of slander to man or woman, the which were not slandered before among good men and worthy, so that he or she should be called to judgment, a purgation assigned to them on the said crime, or grieved in any other wise. And also those that receive the king's writs or commandments to take such as be accursed, for need or favour or any other wilful causes they do not due execution thereof, and those that let such executions or procure wrongful deliverance of such that be accursed. And also all those that take wasting or withdrawing out of house, manors, granges, or other places of archbishops, bishops, or any other person of Holy Church against their will, or against the will of such persons as are ordained and deputed keepers thereof. Also all those that draw out of sanctuary any man or woman that flee to church or churchyard, or cloister, for girth or impunity of Holy Church, or let or forbid necessary livelihood to be given to such persons being within sanctuary. And those that put violent hands on priest or on clerk. Also all those that use any witchcraft, or give thereto faith and credence, and all false swearers, and others that are forsworn on book, or off any other holy

thing. And all those that do simony or sacrilege, heretics, Lollards, and fautors of any famous thieves, robbers, rievers, and ravishers; falsaries of the Popes, or the Kings, or of any ordinary of Holy Church. And they that let execution of true testaments or last wills, and withholders of tithes or any other spiritual commodities that belong to Holy Church."

1439.

That those who sue in ecclesiastical courts for the augmentation of small vicarages may be allowed to plead *in formâ pauperis.*

ARCHBISHOP STAFFORD'S CONSTITUTION, 1445,

Decrees the observation of the Feast of the Translation of Edward the Confessor.

ARCHBISHOP BOURCHIER'S CONSTITUTION, 1454,

Ordains that all clerks and laics in cathedral, collegiate, and parochial churches, on Lord's days and festivals, celebrate processions "in a most devout, affectionate, and solemn manner, and sing or say the litanies with other suffrages that are seasonable and acceptable to God, as well on those Lord's Days and festivals, as on every Wednesday and Friday, with all humility of heart, for the driving away and removing far from the bounds of the Christian world the wicked powers of them that are enemies to the Christian orthodox faith, and its professors, and for the total extinguishing and (may God so please) the exterminating of them, and for restoring and perfecting the welfare of our lord the king and this famous kingdom of England."

A.D. 1463.

1. That no arrests are to be made in churches.
2. Regulates the apparel of the clergy. (See page 502.)

[Constitutions of the province of York set forth by Archbishops Zouche, Thoresby, Kemp, and Nevil.]

ARCHBISHOP ZOUCHE'S CONSTITUTIONS, A.D. 1347.

1. Stipendiary chaplains not to receive more than six marks annual payment; no chantries to be served until the parish churches are provided with chaplains at this payment.

2. Mothers and nurses not to have their infants in bed with them for fear of overlaying them.

3. Clergy not to be disturbed or impeded in taking away their tithe-corn.

4. Persons not to be allowed to alienate their property when alive, instead of willing it.

5. Priests not to wear clothes "ridiculous and remarkable for their shortness."

6. Archdeacons and others having ecclesiastical jurisdiction to appoint fit persons to be their substitutes.

7. Clandestine marriages forbidden. Banns to be always published on three holy days. Strict inquiries to be made.

Archbishop Thoresby's Constitution, 1363.

1. Markets not to be held in churches, or the porches and cemeteries thereof, on the Lord's day or other festivals, and no "wrestlings, fightings, or shootings," to be performed therein.

2. Vigils and exequies for the dead to be observed with solemnity and prayer for the dead, and not polluted with the grievous excesses which often accompany them.

3 Renews Archbishop Zouche's Constitution as to the salary of stipendiary priests.

4 Gives modifications as to the excommunication incurred for clandestine marriages.

5 Gives a list of the greater crimes which either incur *irregularity*, or are reserved for absolution to the Apostolic See. [These are in number 37. No. 19 is as follows]:—"When archdeacons, deans, rural deans, provosts, chanters, and other clergymen that have parsonages, and priests, study law or physic, unless within two months' space they wholly desist." No. 33. "When one is ordained out of the Ember days or otherwise in an unlawful manner, and ministers before he has obtained a dispensation."

Archbishop Kemp's Constitutions, A.D. 1464.

1 Repeats Archbishop Winchelsea's Constitution (No. 5), as to stipendiary priests in their relations to the incumbents of churches.

2 Forbids abbots and other heads of religious houses to sell the goods of the house, or to sell or grant "corrodies," or to let churches to farm, or to give away the goods belonging to the community, "by occasion whereof their monasteries, houses, and places thereunto belonging, are under great want of repair and

ready to fall, divine worship in such places is diminished, regular observances are neglected, and the goods of such places are wasted and to our great grief consumed."

By a Constitution passed by William Booth, Archbishop of York, at a Convocation in his Cathedral Church A.D. 1462,

It was agreed as follows:—

"The prelates and clergy in Convocation 1462 do unanimously will and grant that the effects of the provincial constitutions of the province of Canterbury, had and observed before these times, being no wise repugnant or prejudicial to the Constitutions of York, be admitted, and not otherwise, nor in any other manner; and that such Constitutions of the province of Canterbury, and the effects thereof in manner aforesaid, be inserted among the Constitutions of the province of York and incorporated, to be kept together with them for the future, and be observed for law, as there is great occasion, and as decency requires."

[Notwithstanding this acceptance, Archbishop Nevil, 1466, thought it necessary to confirm spetially some of the Canterbury Constitutions.]

1. He confirms in Synod Const. 9 of Archbishop Peckham, beginning the "Ignorance of priests."

2. The fifth of Archbishop Stratford for tithe of timber trees.

3. The ninth of Stratford against fraudulent deeds of gifts.

4 and 5. The twelfth of Stratford against obstruction of ecclesiastical process.

6. The last of Stratford against fraudulent suits.

[Adding these new ones.]

7. To check the proceedings of "questors" or the sellers of indulgences, not allowing them to exceed in their offers of indulgences what has been published by authority of the Pope. "Some questors, with extreme impudence and to the deception of souls, have granted indulgences to the people from a motion of their own, have dispensed with vows, have absolved from murders, perjuries, and other sins, have remitted what has been stolen for an uncertain sum of money given unto them, have relaxed a third or fourth part of penances enjoined, have falsely affirmed that they have drawn three or more souls of the parents

and friends of those who have given them alms out of purgatory and conveyed them to the joys of paradise, have given plenary remission of sins to their benefactors in the places where they were questors, and, to use their own words, have absolved them from all punishment and guilt."

8 Ordains that all are to contribute to the Parish Church, even though they may have to contribute to private chapels.

9 Ordains that monks are not to live alone, absent from monasteries.

10 Forbids arrests in Church.

11 Is the same (nearly) with sixth of Archbishop Winchelsea's, regulating tithes.

TABLE OF SUCCESSION OF ENGLISH KINGS, ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY, AND POPES.

Date.	Kings of England.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Popes.	Date.
590	...	...	Gregory the Great	590
597	...	Augustine . . .	...	597
604	...	Lawrence . . .	Sabinianus . . .	604
606	...	...	Boniface III. . .	606
607	...	...	Boniface IV. . .	607
614	...	...	Deusdedit . . .	614
617	...	...	Boniface V. . .	617
619	...	Mellitus . . .	...	619
624	...	Justus. . . .	...	624
626	...	...	Honorius I. . .	626
627	...	Honorius . . .	...	627
639	...	...	Severinus . . .	639
639	...	...	John IV. . . .	639
641	...	...	Theodorus . . .	641
649	...	...	Martin I. . . .	649
655	...	Deusdedit . . .	Eugenius . . .	655
655	...	...	Vitatianus . . .	655
668	...	Theodore . . .	...	668
669	...	..	Adeodatus . . .	669
676	...	...	Domnus . . .	676
678	...	...	Agathon . . .	678
683	...	...	Leo II.	683
684	...	.	Benedict II. . .	684
685	...	...	John V. . . .	685
686	...	...	Conon	686
687	. .	...	Sergius	687
693	.	Bertwald . . .	...	693
701	...	...	John VI. . . .	701
705	...	...	John VII. . . .	705
708	...	...	Sinsinius I., Constantine	708
714	...	...	Gregory II. . .	714
731	...	Tatwin . . .	Gregory III. . .	731
735	...	Nothelm . . .	...	735
741	...	Cuthbert . . .	Zachary . . .	741
752	...	...	Stephen II. & III.	752
757	...	...	Paul I.	757
759	...	Breogwine . . .	...	759
763	...	Jaenbert . . .	...	763
768	...	...	Stephen IV. . .	768
772	...	...	Adrian I. . . .	772

Date.	Kings of England.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Popes.	Date.
790	...	Ethelheard . . .	...	790
795	...	...	Leo III. . . .	795
803	...	Wulfred . . .	...	803
816	...	...	Stephen V. . .	816
817	...	...	Pascal I. . . .	817
824	...	...	Eugenius II. . .	824
827	Egbert . .	...	Valentin . . .	827
827	...	...	Gregory IV. . .	827
829	...	Fleogild . . .	...	829
830	...	Ceolnoth . . .	...	830
836	Ethelwulf .	...	...	836
844	. .	...	Sergius II. . .	844
847	...	...	Leo IV. . . .	847
854	...	...	Benedict III. . .	854
858	Ethelbald .	...	Nicholas I. . .	858
860	Ethelberht .	...	...	860
866	Ethelred . .	...	...	866
867	...	...	Adrian II. . . .	867
870	...	Ethelred . . .	...	870
871	Alfred . . .	...	...	871
872	...	...	John VIII. . .	872
882	...	...	Martin II. . . .	882
884	...	...	Adrian III. . .	884
885	...	...	Stephen VI. . .	885
891	...	Plegmund . . .	Formosus . . .	891
897	...	...	Boniface VI. . / Stephen VII. .	897
901	Edward the Elder	...	Theodorus II. . / John IX. . .	901
905	...	...	Benedict IV. . .	905
906	...	...	Leo V. . . . / Christopher .	906
907	...	...	Sergius III. . .	907
910	...	...	Anastatius III. .	910
912	...	...	Lando	912
913	...	...	John X. . . .	913
923	...	Æthelm . . .	...	923
925	Athelstan . .	...	...	925
928	...	Wulfelm . . .	Leo VI. . . .	928
929	...	...	Stephen VIII. .	929
931	...	...	John XI. . . .	931
936	...	...	Leo VII. . . .	936
939	...	...	Stephen IX. . .	939
940	Edmund . .	...	...	940
941	...	Odo	...	941
943	...	...	Martin III. . .	943
946	...	...	Agapetus . . .	946
947	Edred . . .	...	...	947

Date.	Kings of England.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Popes.	Date.
955	Edwig . . .	...	John XII. . . .	955
958	Edgar . . .	...	...	958
959	...	Dunstan . . .	...	959
963	...	...	Leo VIII. . . .	963
964	...	...	Benedict V. . .	964
965	...	...	John XIII. . .	965
972	...	...	Domnus II. .) Benedict VI. .)	972
974	...	...	Boniface VII. . .	974
975	Edward the Martyr	...	Benedict VII. . .	975
979	Ethelred the Unready	...	...	979
984	...	...	John XIV. . . .	984
985	...	...	John XV. . . .	985
988	...	Ethelgar . . .	...	988
990	...	Siric	...	990
995	...	Ælfric	...	995
996	...	...	Gregory V. . .	996
999	...	...	Silvester II. . .	999
1003	...	...	John XVI. .) John XVII. .)	1003
1006	...	Ælfeah (Elphege) .	...	1006
1009	...	...	Sergius IV. . .	1009
1012	...	...	Benedict VIII. .	1012
1013	...	Lyfing . . .	...	1013
1016	Edmund Ironside	...	...	1016
1017	Cnut . . .	...	...	1017
1020	...	Ethelnoth . . .	...	1020
1024	...	...	John XVIII. . .	1024
1034	...	...	Benedict IX. . .	1034
1037	Harold . . .	...	...	1037
1038	...	Eadsige . . .	...	1038
1040	Harthacnut .	...	...	1040
1042	Edward the Confessor	...	...	1042
1044	...	...	Gregory VI. . .	1044
1046	...	...	Clement . . .	1046
1048	...	...	Damasus II. . .	1048
1049	...	...	Leo IX. . . .	1049
1050	...	Robert of Jumièges .	...	1050
1052	...	Stigand . . .	...	1052
1054	...	...	Victor II. . . .	1054
1057	...	...	Stephen X. . .	1057
1059	...	...	Nicholas II. . .	1059
1061	...	...	Alexander II. . .	1061
1066	Harold . . .	...	...	1066

Date.	Kings of England.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Popes.	Date.
1066	William I.	...	...	1066
1070	...	Lanfranc	...	1070
1073	...	...	Gregory VII.	1073
1086	...	...	Victor III.	1086
1087	William II.	...	...	1087
1088	...	...	Urban II.	1088
1093	...	Anselm	...	1093
1099	...	...	Pascal II.	1099
1100	Henry I.	...	...	1100
1114	...	Ralph (de Turbine)	...	1114
1118	...	...	Gelasus II.	1118
1119	...	...	Calixtus	1119
1123	...	William (de Curbellio)	...	1123
1124	...	...	Honorius II.	1124
1130	...	...	Innocent II.	1130
1135	Stephen	...	..	1135
1139	...	Theobald	...	1139
1143	...	...	Celestine II.	1143
1144	...	...	Lucius II.	1144
1145	...	...	Eugenius III.	1145
1153	...	...	Anastatius IV.	1153
1154	Henry II.	...	Adrian IV.	1154
1159	...	...	Alexander III.	1159
1162	...	Thomas Becket	...	1162
1174	...	Richard of Dover	...	1174
1181	...	...	Lucius III.	1181
1184	...	Baldwin	...	1184
1185	...	...	Urban III.	1185
1187	...	...	Gregory VIII.	1187
1188	...	...	Clement III.	1188
1189	Richard I.	...	...	1189
1191	...	Reginald Fitz-Joceline	Celestine III.	1191
1193	...	Hubert Walter	...	1193
1198	...	...	Innocent III.	1198
1199	John	...	...	1199
1207	...	Stephen Langton	...	1207
1216	Henry III.	...	Honorius III.	1216
1227	...	...	Gregory IX.	1227
1229	...	Richard Weathershed	...	1229
1233	...	Edmund of Abingdon	...	1233
1241	...	...	Celestine IV.	1241
1243	...	...	Innocent IV.	1243
1245	...	Boniface of Savoy	...	1245
1254	...	...	Alexander IV.	1254
1261	...	...	Urban IV.	1261
1265	...	...	Clement IV.	1265
1271	...	...	Gregory X.	1271
1272	Edward I.	Robert Kilwardby	...	1272

Date.	Kings of England.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Popes.	Date.
1276	...	...	Innocent V. / Adrian V. / John XIX.	1276
1277	...	...	Nicholas III.	1277
1279	...	John de Peccham	...	1279
1281	...	...	Martin IV.	1281
1285	...	...	Honorius IV.	1285
1288	...	...	Nicholas IV.	1288
1294	...	Robert Winchelsea	Celestine V. / Boniface VIII.	1294
1303	...	...	Benedict X.	1303
1305	...	...	Clement V.	1305
1307	Edward II.	...	...	1307
1314	...	Walter Reynolds	...	1314
1316	...	...	John XX.	1316
1327	Edward III.	...	...	1327
1328	...	Simon de Mepham	...	1328
1333	...	John Stratford	...	1333
1334	...	...	Benedict XI.	1334
1342	...	...	Clement VI.	1342
1348	...	John de Ufford	...	1348
1349	...	Thomas Bradwardine	...	1349
1349	...	Simon Islip	...	1349
1352	...	...	Innocent VI.	1352
1362	...	...	Urban V.	1362
1366	...	Simon Langham	...	1366
1369	...	William Wittlesey	...	1369
1370	...	...	Gregory XI.	1370
1375	...	Simon Sudbury	...	1375
1377	Richard II.	...	...	1377
1378	...	...	Urban VI.	1378
1381	...	William Courtney	...	1381
1389	...	...	Boniface IX.	1389
1397	...	Thomas Arundel	...	1397
1398	...	Roger Walden	...	1398
1399	Henry IV.	Thomas Arundel (restored)	...	1399
1404	...	...	Innocent VII.	1404
1406	...	...	Gregory XII.	1406
1409	...	...	Alexander V.	1409
1410	...	...	John XXI.[1]	1410
1413	Henry V.	...	...	1413
1414	...	Henry Chichele	...	1414
1417	...	...	Martin V.	1417
1422	Henry VI.	...	...	1422
1431	...	...	Eugene IV.	1431
1443	...	John Stafford	...	1443
1447	...	...	Nicholas V.	1447

[1] Another method of calculation inserts two other early Popes of this name, thus advancing the number of the later Johns by two.

Date.	Kings of England.	Archbishops of Canterbury.	Popes.	Date.
1452	...	John Kemp . .	...	1452
1454	...	Thomas Bourchier .	...	1454
1455	...	...	Calixtus III. . .	1455
1458	...	...	Pius II.	1458
1461	Edward IV. .	...	...	1461
1464	...	...	Paul II. . . .	1464
1471	...	...	Sixtus IV. . .	1471
1483	Edward V. .	...	...	1483
1483	Richard III. .	...	...	1483
1484	...	...	Innocent VIII. .	1484
1485	Henry VII. .	...	...	1485
1486	...	John Morton . .	...	1486
1492	...	...	Alexander VI. .	1492
1501	...	Henry Deane . .	...	1501
1503	...	...	Pius III. . . / Julius II. . .	1503
1504	...	William Warham .	...	1504
1509	Henry VIII. .	...	...	1509

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF EVENTS.

DATE		PAGE
304.	Martyrdom of St. Alban	5
314.	Council of Arles	5
325.	Council of Nicæa	6
347.	Council of Sardica	6
359.	Council of Rimini	7
409.	Pelagius publishes his tenets at Rome	9
429.	Mission of Germanus and Lupus—Hallelujah Battle	11
447.	Mission of Germanus and Severus—Overthrow of Pelagianism	12
520.	Battle of Badon Hill	14
564.	Gildas writes *De excidio Britanniæ*	14
597.	Mission of Augustine—Baptism of Ethelbert	22
601.	Mission of Mellitus, Justus, Paulinus, and Ruffinianus	26
603.	Conference with British Bishops at Augustine's Oak	31
604.	Sees of London and Rochester founded	32
,,	Death of Augustine—Succession of Laurentius	32
616.	Mellitus and Justus driven from their Sees	35
625.	Paulinus accompanies Ethelburga to Northumbria	37
627.	Conference at York—Baptism of Eadwin	39
,,	Honorius consecrated by Paulinus at Lincoln	41
633.	Battle of Hatfield—Death of Eadwin	41
634.	Battle of Dilston or Heavenfield	42
635.	Birinus founds See of Dorchester—Felix that of Dunwich	47-48
642.	Battle of Maserfield—Death of Oswald	43
653.	Baptism of Peada—Mission to Mid-Angles	49
654.	Cedd, Bishop of London (East Saxons)	51
655.	Battle of Wingfield—Christianity established in Northumbria	44
656.	Foundation of Medeshamstede (Peterborough)	54
664.	Conference at Whitby	52
,,	Wighard sent to Rome	57
668.	Consecration of Archbishop Theodore	58

DATE		PAGE
669.	Wilfrid, Bishop of York—Chad at Lichfield	50
673.	Council of Hertford	59
678.	Division of Northumbrian Diocese—Appeal of Wilfrid	61
679.	Division of Mercian Diocese	61
680.	Council of Hatfield	62
681.	Wilfrid converts the South Saxons	65
685.	Synod of Twyford—Further division of Northumbrian Diocese	62
690.	Death of Archbishop Theodore	62
„	Laws of King Ina	69
691.	Banishment of Wilfrid—He acts as Bishop of Leicester	66
692.	Witan of Bapchild	69
696.	Witan of Basted	69
702.	Synod of Easterfield—Wilfrid's second appeal	67
705.	Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne	70
706.	Synod of the Nidd—Wilfrid submits	67
709.	Death of Wilfrid	67
734.	Egbert first Archbishop of York	75
735.	Death of the Venerable Bede	72
747.	Council of Clovesho	77
787.	Council of Chelsea—Bishop of Lichfield, Metropolitan	80
794.	Council of Frankfort—Alcuin Education Minister to Charlemagne	84
803.	Council of Clovesho—Lichfield reduced to a Suffragan See	87
808.	Quarrel of Kenulf and Wulfred—a six years' Interdict	91
816.	Council of Chelsea—Consecration and Ornament of Churches	92
825.	Council of Clovesho—Restoration of Archiepiscopal Property	92
855.	Regulation and Legalising of Tithes by King Ethelwulf	94
„	Martyrdom of King Edmund	95
871.	Alfred succeeds to the Throne of Wessex	96
879.	Ecclesiastical Laws of King Alfred	96
905.	Consecration of Bishops by Archbishop Plegmund	102
925.	Ecclesiastical Laws of Athelstan	108
942.	Archbishop Odo publishes his Constitutions	108
959.	Dunstan, Archbishop—Contest between Seculars and Regulars	111
978.	Council of Calne—Triumph of Dunstan's Policy	115
988.	Death of Dunstan	117
994.	Canons of Ælfric	124
995.	Ælfric Archbishop of Canterbury	129
1007.	Council of Eynsham	131
1011.	Destruction of Canterbury by the Danes—Murder of Archbishop Elphege	132
1014.	Council of Habam	133

DATE		PAGE
1017.	Cnut King of all England	134
1020.	Consecration of the Church of Assandun	139
1027.	Cnut's Visit to Rome	140
1043.	Coronation of King Edward the Confessor	145
1050.	See of Devonshire removed from Crediton to Exeter	146
„	Synod of Vercellæ—Bishop Ulf admitted through bribery	147
„	Robert of Jumiéges, Archbishop of Canterbury	148
1052.	Stigand appointed Archbishop by Witan	149
1060.	Consecration of Earl Harold's Collegiate Church of Waltham	151
1061.	Wulfstan consecrated Bishop of Worcester	153
1065.	Consecration of Westminster Abbey Church	154
1067.	Remigius consecrated to Dorchester by Stigand	157
1070.	Council of Winchester—Deposition of Stigand	159
,,	Council of Windsor—Deposition of English Bishops	160
,,	Consecration of Lanfranc to Primacy of English Church	162
1072.	Council of Winchester (Easter)—York declared subject to Canterbury	164
,,	Synod of Windsor (Whitsuntide)—Precedence of Bishops	164
1075.	Council of London—Sees to be removed to *civitates*	166
1076.	Council of Winchester—Celibacy of the Clergy	167
1085.	St. Osmund draws up his *Custom-Book*	173
1089.	Death of Archbishop Lanfranc	177
1093.	Consecration of Anselm to the Primacy	180
1095.	Council of Rockingham—Anselm outlawed	183
1097.	Anselm goes to Rome to lay his cause before the Pope	185
1099.	Council of the Lateran—Anselm present	186
1100.	Anselm returns to England ; Henry I.	187
1102.	Synod of Westminster—correction of morals	189
1103.	Anselm sent to Rome by King—not allowed to return	194
1106.	Return of Anselm	196
1107.	Council of London—Settlement of the Investiture Dispute	196
1108.	Council of London—Clerical Matrimony	200
1109.	Foundation of See of Ely—Hervey first Bishop	201
„	Death of Anselm	203
1114.	Council of Windsor—Ralph appointed Archbishop	204
1119.	Thurstan consecrated Archbishop of York by the Pope—Subjection to Canterbury dispensed with	206
1123.	William of Corbeil elected Archbishop of Canterbury	208
1125.	Legatine Synod at Westminster	210
1126.	Archbishop of Canterbury becomes Legate of the Pope, (*Legatus natus*)	212
1127.	Legatine Synod at Westminster under Archbishop	213
1128.	Cistercian Monks established in England (*Waverley*)	214
1129.	Synod to prohibit Clerical Matrimony	214

DATE		PAGE
1132.	Foundation of Fountains Abbey	214
1133.	Foundation of See of Carlisle. Austin Canons	215
1135.	Death of King Henry I.	216
1135.	Charter of King Stephen	219
1139.	Seizure of the Bishops of Salisbury and Lincoln by the King	222
„	Henry Bishop of Winchester calls a Council as Legate of the Pope	223
1143.	Archbishop Theobald introduces the Canon Law into England	224
„	The Archbishop lays the land under interdict	229
1153.	Death of St. William of York	227
1161.	Thomas Becket nominated to the Primacy	232
1162.	Election and Consecration of Becket	233
1163.	First quarrel of Henry II. and Becket at Woodstock	235
„	Council of Westminster—"The Ancient Customs"	236
1164.	Council of Clarendon (January)	238
„	Council of Northampton (October)—Flight of Becket	241
1166.	Becket pronounces excommunications at Vezelai	247
1170.	Becket returns to England (December 1)	249
„	Murder of Becket in Canterbury Cathedral (December 29)	251
1173.	Canonisation of Becket	264
1174.	Archbishop Richard consecrated by Pope	264
„	Burning of the Cathedral of Canterbury	266
1175.	Synod of Westminster	267
1176.	Synod of Westminster—Quarrel between Archbishops of Canterbury and York	270
„	Synod of Winchester	271
1179.	II. Lateran Council	273
1184.	Baldwin Archbishop of Canterbury	274
1186.	Hugh of Burgundy, Bishop of Lincoln	282
1187.	Capture of Jerusalem by Saladin	277
1189.	Innocent III. Pope	286
„	Council of Pipewell Abbey	279
1190.	Archbishop Baldwin goes to the Crusade	279
1193.	Hubert Walter Archbishop of Canterbury	281
1195.	Trial of Archbishop Geoffrey at York	285
„	Hubert Walter holds Legatine Council at York	285
1200.	Legatine Council at Westminster	288
1207.	Stephen Langton Archbishop of Canterbury	292
1208.	England put under Interdict	295
1209.	King John excommunicated	299
1213.	King John cedes his kingdom to the Pope	302
„	Return of the banished Bishops	303
„	Stephen Langton promulgates Charter of Henry I.	306

DATE		PAGE
1214.	Removal of the Interdict	310
1215.	Great Charter signed	310
,,	III. Lateran Council	316
1216.	Death of King John	313
1218.	Translation of St. Wulfstan—Worcester Cathedral consecrated	314
1219.	The Dominican Friars reach England	317
1220.	Translation of St. Hugh	314
,,	Translation of St. Thomas Becket	315
1222.	Council of Oxford	316
1224.	The Franciscans reach England	317
1226.	Pope Honorius III. makes a demand for English benefices	318
1231.	The Lewythiel Riots in England	322
1233.	Edmund Rich Archbishop of Canterbury	324
1235.	Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln	325
1237.	Legatine Council of London	327
1240.	Archbishop Edmund resigns his See	332
1243.	Boniface elected Archbishop	336
1245.	Council of Lyons under Innocent IV.	338
1247.	Bishop Grosseteste opposes Papal exactions	341
1248.	Parliament at Westminster refuses the King supplies	342
1250.	Bishop Grosseteste's sermon at Lyons	342
1252.	Bishop Grosseteste resists the King's demands	345
1253.	Bishop Grosseteste refuses to institute the Pope's nephew	346
,,	Death of Bishop Grosseteste	350
1255.	Proctors of the Clergy heard in Parliament	358
1257.	Archbishop of Messina pleads before Parliament	360
,,	A Convocation under Archbishop Boniface	361
1258.	Convocation of Merton under Archbishop Boniface	362
,,	Parliament of Oxford	363
1259.	Murder of a Roman Prebendary of St. Paul's	364
1264.	Battle of Lewes	365
1265.	Battle of Evesham	366
1266.	Arrival of Cardinal Othobon as Legate	366
1268.	Legatine Council at St. Paul's	367
1269.	Completion of rebuilding of Westminster Abbey	368
1270.	Burning of Monastery and Cathedral at Norwich	368
1272.	Accession of Edward I.	369
1274.	Council of Lyons	374
1279.	John de Peccham Archbishop	376
,,	Council of Reading	377
1280.	Statute *de viris religiosis* (Statute of Mortmain)	378
1281.	Convocation at Lambeth	379
1283.	Provincial Councils of Clergy and Laity	381

DATE		PAGE
1283.	First Convocation with diocesan Proctors	381
1285.	Statute of *circumspectè agatis*	382
1291.	New Valuation of Ecclesiastical Revenues	383
1294.	Clergy of both Provinces summoned by King	384
1295.	Parliamentary Summons of Clergy by *Præmunientes* Clause	385
1296.	Bull of Boniface VIII. ; *Clericis laicos*	386
1297.	Convocation of Canterbury outlawed	387
„	Convocation agrees to grant subsidies without leave of the Pope	391
1301.	Parliament of Lincoln	392
1305.	Archbishop Winchelsea condemned by Pope	393
1307.	Statute of Carlisle	394
1308.	Process against the Templars in England	395
1316.	Statute of *articuli cleri*	397
1324.	Trial of Bishop Orlton by Lay Court	398
„	Birth of John Wycliffe	413
1327.	Simon Mepham Archbishop	400
1328.	Observance of Good Friday ordered	401
1333.	John Stratford Archbishop	403
1343.	Clement VI. "provides" for two Cardinals in England	404
„	King's Letter in defence of the Church	406
1344.	Statute to regulate Prohibitions	406
„	Petition of the Commons against Pope's action affirmed	408
1351.	First Statute of Provisors	408
1352.	Ordinance to confirm Provisors Statute	409
1353.	First Statute of Præmunire	409
1363.	Wycliffe proceeds Doctor in Divinity	415
1366.	Wycliffe defends refusal of subsidy to the Pope	416
1371.	Anti-clerical feeling developed in Parliament	417
1376.	Meeting of the "Good Parliament"	418
1376.	Wycliffe's Propositions sent to the Pope	421
1377.	Pope Gregory issues Bulls against Wycliffe	422
1378.	Wycliffe summoned to St. Paul's and Lambeth	425
„	Murder of Archbishop Sudbury	427
1381.	Wycliffe publishes his Propositions on the Eucharist	427
„	Wycliffe condemned at Oxford	430
1382.	Meeting of the Convocation at Blackfriars	432
„	Meeting of the Convocation at St. Frideswide's	439
„	Bishop Spencer's Crusade	448
1384.	Death of John Wycliffe	444
1388.	Parliament petitions against the Lollards	450
1390.	Re-enactment of the Provisors Statute	453
1393.	Re-enactment of the Præmunire Statute	453
1394.	Lollards Bill brought into Parliament	454

DATE		PAGE
1397.	Archbishop Arundel translated to Canterbury	456
1401.	Enactment of the Statute *De Hæreticis comburendis*	457
„	Burning of William Sawtry	457
1404.	Parliament at Coventry—Church property threatened	461
1407.	Trial of William Thorpe	460
1409.	Constitutions of Archbishop Arundel	460
„	Council of Pisa	497
1410.	Scheme brought into Parliament for seizing Church Lands	462
1413.	Trial of Sir John Oldcastle	463
1414.	Severe law against Lollards	466
„	Council of Constance	470
1415.	Burning of John Claydon	470
1417.	Execution of Sir John Oldcastle	468
1422.	Burning of William Taylor	467
1425.	Burning of Robert Hoke	467
1427.	Cardinal Beaufort appointed Legate by Martin V.	490
1428.	Burning of William White	467
1431.	Burning of Thomas Bagley	468
„	Council of Basle	497
1438.	Pope Eugenius gives Bishopric of Ely *in commendam*	491
1447.	Bishop Pecock's Sermon at Paul's Cross	472
1449.	Publication of "Repressor" by Bishop Pecock	474
1450.	Murder of Adam Moleyns, Bishop of Chichester	473
1452.	Cardinal Kemp Archbishop of Canterbury	494
1454.	Cardinal Bourchier Archbishop	494
1456.	Publication of *Treatise on Faith* by Bishop Pecock	477
1457.	Condemnation of Bishop Pecock	478
„	Bishop Pecock recants his opinions	479
1486.	Cardinal Morton Archbishop	494
1501.	Henry Deane Archbishop	496
1503.	William Warham Archbishop	496

INDEX.

A

Aaron, martyred at Caerleon, 4

Abbots, deposition of, at Westminster, 1102, 192

Abercorn, See of, 61

Abraham of Colchester, burning of, 468

Adelfius, British bishop at Arles, 6

Adrian, Abbot, nominated Archbishop of Canterbury, 57; declines the office, *ib.*; suggests first Andrew, then Theodore, *ib.*

Adrian (I.), Pope, agrees to Lichfield's becoming a Metropolitan See, 80

Adrian (IV.), Pope, rise of to the papacy, 258; grants exemptions to St. Alban's, 259

Adulf, Bishop, first bishop of Carlisle, 215; settles Austin Canons as his chapter, 216

Ælfric, Archbishop of Canterbury, early life and works of, 123; Bishop of Ramsbury, 124; Canons of addressed to Wulfsine, *ib.*; teaching of on the Holy Eucharist, 128, and note; learning of, 129, note; succeeds to Canterbury, *ib.*; honour paid to him at Rome, 130; removes secular clerks from Christ Church, *ib.*; list of works of, 143

Ælfric, Archbishop of York, supports tyrannical proceedings of Harthacnut, 142; holds see of Worcester in plurality with York, *ib.*; forced upon Worcester diocese, *ib.*; causes city of Worcester to be burned and spoiled, *ib.*; elected to succeed Eadsige, 147

Æthelmær, Bishop, deposed at Winchester, 159

Æthelric, Bishop, deposed and imprisoned by Council of Windsor, 160

Æthelwine, Bishop, outlawed by Council of Winchester, 160

Ægilbert, Bishop, occupies see of Wessex, 48; retires in disgust, *ib.*; declines to return to Wessex, 49; sends Leutherius (or Lothair), *ib.*; at the Conference at Whitby, 52

Agricola, introduces Pelagianism into Britain, 10

Aidan, Saint, sent to Northumbria from Iona, 43; founds a religious house at Lindisfarne, *ib.*; zeal and devotion of, *ib.*; death of, 43

Alban, Saint, martyrdom of, 45

Alban's, Saint, Monastery of, obtains exemption from Episcopal control, 258, 259; first mitred abbey in England, 259, note; meeting at, on the ceasing of the interdict, 303, 307; scandalous immorality of, 503.

Alchfrid, son of Oswy, instructed by Wilfrid, 52; at the Whitby Conference, *ib.*

Alcuin, early life of, 82; educational minister to Charlemagne, *ib.*; directed by Charlemagne to consult English Church on image worship, 83; letter of to monks at Wearmouth, *ib.*; to bishop and clergy of Lindisfarne, 84; to Ethelheard, Archbishop of Canterbury, 84, 85, 86; censures the English clergy, 86; offers horse to Ethelheard, 87; letter to Charlemagne in favour of Ethelheard, *ib.*

Aldhelm, Bishop, Abbot of Malmsbury, 69; letter of to the British Churches, 70; first bishop of Sherborne, *ib.*; founds abbey of Abingdon, *ib.*; enriches Glastonbury, 71

Alexander III., Pope, perplexity of in the Becket quarrel, 240, 248; hears the case against Becket at Sens, 245; restores the primacy to Becket, 246; checks the bitter temper of Becket, 247; issues commissions to legates in the quarrel, 249; grants letters of excommunication of English bishops, *ib.*; gives absolution to Henry II., 252; confirms privileges of St. Albans, 259; consecrates Richard to Canterbury, 264; claims right of confirming suffragan bishops, 265

Alexander, Bishop of Lincoln, seized by King Stephen, 221; bad repute of, *ib.*, note; castles built by, 222; religious houses built by, *ib.*, note

Alfere, Ealdorman of Mercia, opposes Dunstan, 116

Alfred, King, translates Bede's Ecclesiastical History, 33; crowned at Rome, 95; defeats Danes at Ethandune, 96; publishes ecclesiastical laws, 96; preface of, to the pastoral of St. Gregory, 99;

other translations made by, 101; schools established by, 101
Alhfleda, daughter of Oswy, marries Peada, 49
Alstan, Bishop, conspires against Ethelwulf, 94
Amesbury Monastery, refounded by Henry II., 272
Anglia, East, conversion of, 47; received gospel from Northumbria, 51
Annates, beginning of tax of, 508 and note
Anselm, St., Archbishop, early life of, 177; visits of to England, 178; draws up form of prayer for English Church, *ib.;* sent for to Rufus in his illness, *ib.;* nominated to primacy, 179; reluctance of to undertake the post, *ib.;* makes conditions with Rufus, *ib.;* does homage to the king for temporalties, 180; consecration of, *ib.;* refuses to give money to king, *ib.;* leaves the Synod at Hastings, 181; desires leave to go to Rome for the Pall, 182; at the Council of Rockingham, *ib.;* refuses to acknowledge the Antipope, 183; declared outlawed, *ib.;* refuses to receive the Pall from the king, 184; desires leave to go to Rome, 185; goes to Papal Court, 185; long absence of, abroad, *ib.;* styled *Alterius orbis Papa*, 185, and note; consecrates first bishop of Waterford, *ib.;* at Council of the Lateran, 1099, 186; return of to England, 187; first relations of with Henry I., 188; refuses homage to the king, *ib.;* refers to the Pope, 188, 189; holds a Synod at Westminster, *ib.;* refuses to consecrate clerks appointed by king, 192; refuses the *paternæ consuetudines*, 193; sent to Rome, *ib.;* long sojourn of at Lyons, 194; determines to excommunicate the king, *ib.;* another reference to Rome, *ib.;* letter to, describing sad state of English Church, 195; remonstrates with the king for oppressing the clergy, 195; agrees to compromise as to homage, 196; consecrates bishops, returns to his see (1106), 196; raises character of English Church, 199; instrumental in founding See of Ely, 201; dispute of, with Thomas II., Archbishop of York, 202; takes measures to ensure subjection of York, 203; death and character of, *ib.;* literary works of, 217
Anselm, nephew of Archbishop, induces Pope to send the Pall by him to England, 204; brings commission from the Pope to act as Legate, 205; not allowed to enter England as Legate, 205
Appeals to Rome, abuses produced by, 260
Arianism, not prevalent in Britain, 7
Arles, Council of, British bishops at, 5; decisions of the, 6
Arminius, British deacon at Arles, 6
Articuli Cleri, statute of, 397, 398

Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, translated to Canterbury, 456; translated by Pope against his will to St. Andrews, *ib.;* restored to Canterbury, *ib.;* presides in Convocation (1401), 457; gives benefice to Purveye, 459; conducts examination of William Thorpe, 459; publishes Constitutions (1409), 460; tries Sir John Oldcastle, 462, 463, 464, 465; death of, by swelling of tongue, 466
Assandun, Church of, founded by Cnut, 136, and note; consecration of, 139; Stigand, first priest of, *ib.*
Asser, Bishop, teacher of Alfred, 100, 101
Asterius, Bishop, consecrates Birinus, 47
Aston, John, supporter of Wycliffe at Oxford, 436; before Convocation of Canterbury, 438; publishes a broad-sheet to the people, *ib.;* recants, 439
Athelstan, King, ecclesiastical laws of, 103, 104
Augustine, Saint, controversy of, with Pelagius, 8, 9, 10
Augustine, Archbishop of Canterbury, starts on his mission to England, 21; sent back to Gregory, *ib.;* again dispatched by Gregory, *ib.;* ordered to communicate with the French bishops, 22; arrives in England, *ib.;* established at Canterbury, 23; consecrated at Arles by Vergilius, 24; reports progress to Gregory, 26; asks solutions of various difficulties, 24, 25; seeks additional clergy from Gregory, 26; receives the Pall, *ib.;* made head of the English bishops, 27; cautioned by Gregory as to looking for miracles, 28; attempts to reduce the British clergy to obedience, 29, 30, 31; threatens the British bishops, 31; consecrates Laurentius as successor, 32; death and burial of, *ib.;* epitaph of, 33
Augustine's, Saint, at Canterbury, beginning of, 29
Augustine's Oak, meeting at, 29

B

Badby, Thomas, burning of, 462
Badon Hill, battle of, 14
Bagley, Thomas, burning of in 1431, 468
Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, election of, 274; character of, 275, and note; quarrel of with monastery of Christ Church, 275, 276, 277; preaches crusade, 278; joins crusading army, *ib.;* 279
Balle, John, said to be a follower of Wycliffe, 427
Bangor, monasteries so called, 16, 54
Bangor Monastery, monks of, 30; slaughter of by Ethelfrid, 31, and note
Baptism, use of chrism in, 53; regulations as to, 81, 118
Bardney Abbey, foundation of, 55

Basle, Council of, 491, 500
Bath becomes See of Somersetshire bishopric, 166
Beaufort, Cardinal, appointed Cardinal by Martin V., 490, and note; made Legate, but unable to act, *ib.*; leader of the Bohemian war, *ib.*
Beck, Anthony, Bishop, attempts to evade oath of allegiance, 404
Becket Thomas (St.), Archbishop of Canterbury, a clerk of Archbishop Theobald's, 224; sent to Bologna to study Canon Law, *ib.*; appointed Chancellor on recommendation of Archbishop Theobald, 229; work of, as Chancellor, 230, 231; looked on with suspicion by clergy, 232; nominated Archbishop, *ib.*; views of as to the appointment, *ib.*; opposition of Churchmen to, 232, 233; elected by Chapter, 233; consecration of, *ib.*; resigns office of Chancellor, 234; first coldness of with king, 234; attends Council at Tours, *ib.*; quarrel of with Henry II. at Woodstock, 235; resists the king's demands at Westminster, 237; partially reconciled to the king at Woodstock, 238; refuses to accept Constitutions of Clarendon, 239; persuaded into accepting the Constitutions, 240; refuses to put his seal to them, *ib.*, attempts to go to the Pope, 241; brought back, *ib.*; summoned to Northampton, 241; insult offered to, 242; fined five hundred pounds, *ib.*; called to account for moneys received when Chancellor, *ib.*; consults bishops of province, 242; refuses to exhibit his accounts at Northampton, 243; appeals to Rome, *ib.*; says mass of St. Stephen, *ib.*; goes to the Council with cross in hand, *ib.*; bold demeanour of at the Council, 244; leaves the Council, *ib.*; escapes to Lincoln, *ib.*; reaches Gravelines, *ib.*; arrival of at Sens, 245; produces copy of the Constitutions of Clarendon, 246; resigns his Archbishopric to the Pope, *ib.*; reinstated by Pope, *ib.*; retires to Pontigny, *ib.*; life of at Pontigny, 247; checked by Pope Alexander, *ib.*; excommunications by, at Vezelai, *ib.*; driven from Pontigny by Henry II., 248; life of at Sens, 248; reconciliation of with Henry at Freteval, 249; lands at Sandwich, 249; had sent letters of excommunication before him, 249, 250; demands made on his arrival, 250; goes to Canterbury and London, *ib.*; sermon of at Canterbury, *ib.*; angry colloquy of with the four knights, 251; goes into the cathedral, *ib.*; murder of in Canterbury Cathedral, 252; evil consequences of the crime to the Church, 253; murder of, not properly a martyrdom, 254; early life of, *ib.*; decree for canonisation of, 264; translation of (1220), 315

Bede, the Venerable, mention of King Lucius by, 3; account of the martyrdom of St. Alban by, 5; sketch of history of, 33; writings of, 33, 72; early life of, 72; letter of to Bishop Egbert on corruption of monasteries, 73
Benedict Biscop, Character and work of, 71; Abbot of Canterbury, *ib.*; builds monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow, 72
Benedict, St., rule of, not prevailing in English monasteries, 55; introduced at Glastonbury and Abingdon, 111; at Worcester, 112; at Winchester, 113
Beornhelm, Bishop, advocate for secular clergy, 115
Beornwulf, King, supporter of the Church, 93
Bertha, Queen of Ethelbert, a Christian, 20; reproved by Gregory for not having done more to spread Christianity, 22, note; letter of Gregory to, 28; death of, 35
Bertwald, Archbishop, Council held by, at Easterfield, 67; present at the Witan at Bapchild, 69; at Barsted, *ib.*
Beverley, Bishop John of, ordainer of Bede, 33; account of, 74
Birinus, Bishop, sent by Pope Honorius to Wessex, 47; converts large numbers, 48; builds a church at Dorchester, *ib.*; death of, *ib.*
Bishops, English, attend foreign councils, 147; order of precedence of, settled at Windsor, 165; support Anselm as to investitures, 192; call upon Anselm to return 192; bad conduct of in Stephen's time, 220; seizure of by Stephen, 221; forbidden to attend Council at Rheims, 227; plead against Becket at Sens, 237; inclined to yield to Henry II.'s demands at Westminster, 237; support Becket at Clarendon, 239; against Becket on the question of accounts, 242; opinions given by, at Northampton, 242-243; offer to appeal to Pope against Becket, 243; endeavour to induce Becket to yield, 243; send letter of remonstrance to Becket, 248; excommunications of, procured by Becket, 249; appeal of to the king, 250; claim of, to select the Primate, 262-274; choose Roger, Abbot of Bec, *ib.*; claim the right of proclaiming the election, 263; six appointed at Council of London, *ib.*; agree that the monks should select two persons for Primacy, 263; opposed to claims of Rome, 273; secular character of, under Richard I., 280; suffragan of Canterbury declared to have no right to elect Primate, 291; brought back from exile under King John, 303; money compensation promised to, 308; protest of, to Innocent IV. against exactions, 336; at Council of Lyons (1245), 338; involved in obligations by Bishop of Hereford,

357; send representatives to Legate at Boulogne, 365; three of them afterwards go personally, 366; summoned before Cardinal Othobon, 366; three of them ordered to go to Rome, *ib.*; of times of Edward II., bad character of, 399-400; jealousy of power of, 412; call on the Chancellor of Oxford to act against Wycliffe, 424; offended with Bishop Pecock, 472; great unpopularity of in fifteenth century, 473; comparative morality of, 500; secular employments of in fifteenth century, 506

Boniface, Archbishop, joins Willibrord at Utrecht, 71; converts the Germans, *ib.*; Archbishop of Metz, *ib.*; martyrdom of, *ib.*; letter of to King Ethelbald on corrupt state of monasteries, 76; letter of to Archbishop Egbert to support his remonstrance, *ib.*; letter of to Archbishop Cuthbert to recommend a council, 77

Boniface IV., Pope, letter of to Laurentius and Ethelbert, 35

Boniface VIII., Pope, Character of, 386; Bull of called *Clericis Laicos*, *ib.*; relaxes the Bull *Clericis Laicos*, 390

Boniface, of Savoy, Archbishop of Canterbury, election of procured by Pope, 335; character of, *ib.*; election of confirmed by Innocent IV., 336; consecrated at Lyons, 338; demands first-fruits of all benefices in his province, 341; suspends the whole of his suffragans, *ib.*; Metropolitical visitation of, 353, 354; violent proceedings of at St. Bartholomew's, 354; obliged to retire from England, *ib.*; upholds national party, *ib.*; claims government of sees during vacancy, *ib.*; summons a bishop-elect abroad for consecration, *ib.*; summons meeting of Convocation in London, 361; summons Convocation at Merton, 362

Bosa, Bishop of Lindisfarne, 61; removed from York to make room for Wilfrid, 66

Bourchier, Cardinal, institutes inquiry into Pecock's writings, 480; character of, 494; complaints of, against the irregularities of clergy, 502

Brantingham, Bishop, Treasurer in 1371, 417; ordinance of against Friars, 453, note

Britain, Beginning of Christianity in, 1, 2, 3

Brune, Robert de, *Handlyng Synne* of, 511

Burghersh, Bishop, implicated in designs against king, 399

Bury, John, *Gladius Salomonis* of, 481, 482

C

Cadwallader, King, assists the heathen Penda against Eadwin, 41; carries on war in Northumbria, 42; defeated at Dilston, *ib.*

Cædmon, monk, account of, 55

Caerleon, martyrs at, 4, 5; Adelfius (perhaps) bishop of, 6; the most ancient see in Wales, 16

Calixtus II., Pope, promises to do nothing prejudicial to Canterbury, 206; consecrates Archbishop Thurstan, *ib.*; exempts him from subjection to Canterbury, *ib.*; attempts to settle a permanent Legate in England, 207

Calle, John, sentenced to perpetual imprisonment, 468

Cambridge, University of, representation as to olergy, 502

Canons (*See also Constitutions*) of Chelsea, 816, 92; of reign of Edgar, 117, 118, 119, 120; penitential, of reign of Edgar, 119; of Archbishop Ælfric, 124, 125; of Winchester, 1076, 167; of Westminster, 1102, 189; of Westminster, 1125, 210; of Westminster, 1127, 213; of Westminster Synod, 1175, 267

Canons, Austin, characteristics of, 216; first houses of in England, *ib.*; differ from canons secular living in rule, *ib.*, note; offshoots from, *ib.*, note

Canterbury, See of, invasion of the Metropolitan rights of, 80; restored to its full Metropolitan rights, 87; primacy of, determined at Winchester, 164; finally settled at Windsor, *ib.*

Canterbury, Cathedral of, commencement of, 29; restoration of, by Archbishop Odo, 108; rebuilding of, by Lanfranc, 165; stripping of, after murder of Becket, 261; reopening of, *ib.*; burning of, 266

Cantilupe, Walter de, Bishop, speech of, in London Council, 327.

Carileph, William de St., Bishop, chief opponent of Anselm, 184; ill-usage of, by Rufus, *ib.*; account of, 198

Carlisle, foundation of See of, 215

Cathedral churches, rebuilding of after Conquest, 165

Cathedrals, number of secular and monastic, 171, note

Catterick, baptisms at, 40, and note

Caursins, the, first heard of in England, 321

Cedd, Bishop, restores the church among East Saxons, 50; consecrated bishop by St. Finan, 51; second bishop of London, *ib.*; at the Conference at Whitby, 52; acquiesces in Roman uses, 54

Celestine, Pope, said to have sent teachers to Britain against Pelagius, 11

Celestius, a Scotic monk, 8; account of, 8, 9, 10

Cellah, bishop of the Mid-Angles, 10

Ceolfrid, Abbot, instructor of Bede, 72

Ceolnoth, Archbishop, flies to Rome, 96

Ceolwulp, King, patron of Venerable Bede, 72

Chad (Ceadda), St., bishop of the Mid-Angles, 50; consecrated by Wini, *ib.*;

CHALICE.

occupation of York, *ib.*; reconsecrated by Theodore, *ib.*; settled at Lichfield, *ib.*
Chalice not to be made of horn, 81; of pine wood, 126
Charter, the Great, signed by king and barons, 310; ecclesiastical provisions of, 311
Chaucer, Geoffrey, Parson's tale of, 512
Chelsea, Council of, 787, 80; accepts a body of Roman canons, *ib.*; Council of, 816, 92
Chichele, Archbishop, anger of Pope Martin V. with, 486; defence of against Pope, 487; attempt of Pope to punish, 490; resists the appointment of a Legate, *ib.*; applies to Convocation in matter of See of Ely, 491
Christ Church, Canterbury, beginning of, 29; nature of history of, 260; claims to elect the Primate without interference, 261, 262, 274; wealth and luxury of, 275; quarrel of with Archbishop Baldwin, 276, 277; quarrel of with Archbishop Hubert Walter, 282, 283; proceedings of on death of Hubert Walter, 289; monks of sent to Rome by John, 290; compelled to elect Stephen Langton, 291, 292; violent proceedings against, by King John, 294; excommunication of monks of, 334; claims of to confirm suffragan bishops, 373
Chrodegand, rule of for canons secular, 81, note, 146, note; not popular in England, *ib.*
Chrysostom, St., speaks of the British Churches, 7
Church, the British, due to Eastern rather than Western sources, 2; Eastern peculiarities of, 2; planted in second century, 3; architectural traces of, 12; driven into Wales and the western coasts, 14, 18; improvement in at end of sixth century, 16; makes no effort to convert the heathen Teutons, 19; handed over to Augustine by Gregory, 25; dealings of with Augustine, 29, 30, 31; refuses to submit to Augustine, 30; holds off from Archbishop Laurentius, 35; adopts the Catholic Easter, 70; completely in communion with English in time of Alfred, 101, note
Church, the English, planting of, in Kent, 18; among East Saxons, 31; in Northumbria, 34; in East Anglia, 46; in Wessex, 47; in Mercia, 40, 49; among South Saxons, 65; in Isle of Wight, 66
Church and State, relations of, under King Ina, 69
Churches, building of at close of seventh century, 68
Church-rate, early provision for, 138
Circumspectè Agatis, Statute of, 382
Cistercians, entrance of into England, 215; monasteries of founded, *ib.*; exemptions of, 258
Clarendon, Constitutions of, 238, 254; partially abrogated at Avranches, 253; value of, *ib.*

CNUT.

Claudia mentioned by St. Paul, 2; a British Claudia mentioned by Martial, 3
Claydon, John, burning of in 1415, 466
Clement V., Pope, trial of Archbishop Winchelsea by, 393; absolves Edward I. from engagements, *ib.*; exactions of checked by Statute of Carlisle, 394; attempts of to seize patronage of English benefices, 395, 396
Clement VI., Pope, makes "provision" for two cardinals from English Church, 405
Clergy, secular, take the place of monks, 107; oppose Dunstan's policy, 114, 115, 116; English, Danish bishoprics given to, 136; immorality of, at beginning of Henry II.'s reign, 235, 236; persecution of by King John during interdict, 297, 299; defrauded of compensation, 308; exposed to violence in latter days of John, 313; plunder of during war with French, 314; harsh taxations of under Henry III., 321; obliged to borrow of usurers, *ib.*; present their grievances to the king, 329; oppose the demands of Legate, *ib.*; crushed by Roman exactions, 331; successful struggle of against Pope's demand, 333, 334; appeal to Parliament against Rustand's exactions, 358; discipline of enforced by Cardinal Othobon, 367; representation of as to poverty, in 1283, 381; change of tone of, under Edward I., 382; valuation of income of, in 1291, 383; summoned to Parliament by representatives, 385; refuse to contribute to the king, 386, 387; violent contest of with Edward I., 387; outlawed, *ib.*; constrained to yield, 388; refuse to pay taxes without leave of Pope, 389; agree to contribute to king without leave of Pope, 391; privileges conceded to by statute, 398; various forms of summons of, to convocation, 410; of fifteenth century, morality of, 498, 500, 501, 502, 505, 506; the chantry, character of, 505, 506; of fifteenth century, amount of learning of, 507; prevalence of simony among, 507, 508; harassing discipline by, 509; doctrines forced on laity by, 516; amount of wealth of, *ib.*; influence of begins to totter, 517
Clericis laicos, Bull of, 386
Clovesho, Council of, 747, 77; Canons of, 78, 79; Council of, 803, 87; restores the rights of Canterbury, *ib.*; Council of, 825, 92
Cnut becomes King of all England, 134; shows friendly care for the Church, 135; rebuilds and endows monasteries, 136; makes ecclesiastical laws, 136; founds the Church of Assandun, 136; adorns Cathedral of Canterbury, 140; visits Rome, *ib.*; letter of to the English

people, *ib.*; angry with the Pope for extorting large sums for the Pall, *ib.*; favours both seculars and regulars, 141
Coifi, High Priest, declares against idolatry, 38; attacks Temple of Godmundigham, *ib.*
Coinwalch or Kenwealh, King, takes steps for transferring See of West Saxons to Winchester, 48; weary of Bishop Agilbert, *ib.*; brings in Wini as bishop, *ib.*; attributes his defeats to neglect of religion, 49
Colet, Dean, patronised by Archbishop Warham, 496; character of work of, 517, 518
Colman succeeds Finan at Lindisfarne, 52; takes principal part in the Conference at Whitby, 52, 53; retires to Scotland from Lindisfarne, 53
Columba, St., founds monastery at Iona, 42; sketch of his life, 45
Columbanus, St., consulted by Laurentius as to British Church, 35
Compensation for sin—leading idea in Penitential Canons in Edgar's time, 119, 120
Constance, Council of, orders exhumation of Wycliffe's bones, 444, 470; condemns Lollard opinions, 470; condemns the immorality of the clergy, *ib.*; Bishop Hallam at, 499
Constantine, Emperor, connected with Britain, 6
Constantius supports Christianity in Britain, 4
Constitutions (*See also Canons*) of Archbishop Odo, 108, 109; of Cardinal Otho, 327, 352; of Cardinal Othobon, 371; of Archbishop Mepham, 401; of Peckham at Reading, 411; at Lambeth, *ib.*, 412; of Arundel, 1409, 460; of Archbishop Winchelsea, 1305, 524; of Archbishop Reynolds, 1322, 525; of Archbishop Stratford, 1328, 526; of the same, 1343, 527; of Archbishop Islep, 1351, 528; of the same, 1359, 529; of the same, 1362, 530; of Archbishop Langham, 1367, 531; of Archbishop Sudbury, 1378, *ib.*; of Archbishop Courtnay, 1391, 532; of Archbishop Chichele, 1415, 532, 533, 534; of Archbishop Stafford, 1445, 534; of Archbishop Bourchier, 1454, *ib.*; of Archbishop Zouche, 1347, 434; of Archbishop Thoresby, 1363, 535; of Archbishop Kemp, 1464, *ib.*; of Archbishop Booth, 1462, 536; of Archbishop Nevil, 1466, *ib.*
Consuetudines avitæ discussed at Westminster, 237; drawn up at Clarendon, 239
Convocation of Canterbury summoned by Archbishop Boniface, 361; offers Henry III. 52,000 marks, 361; summoned to meet at Merton, 362; determines to resist exactions, *ib.*; meeting of at Lambeth, 1281, 379; meetings of in 1283, 381; violent contest of with Edward I., 387; outlawed, *ib.*; forced to yield to Edward I., 388; meeting of 1297, 389; renewed quarrel of with Edward I., 389; grants a subsidy to king, 390; defends William of Wykeham, 420; meeting of at Blackfriars, 1382, 432; condemns propositions attributed to Wycliffe, 433; meeting of at St. Frideswide's, Oxford, 439; of 1401 petitions for sharp legislation against Lollards, 457; at Oxford, 1409, 460
Convocation of York yields to demands of Edward I., 388; grants a subsidy to king, 391
Cornwall, See of, united to Devonshire by Lyfing, 144
Corsned, a species of clerical ordeal, 137
Council, Ecclesiastical (See also *Synod* and *Convocation*)—Arles, 314, 5; Nicæa, 325, 6; Sardica, 347, *ib.*; Rimini, 359, 7; Hertford, 673, 58; Hatfield, 680, 62; Twyford, 685, *ib.*; Easterfield, 702, 67; the Nidd, 706, *ib.*; Clovesho, 747, 77; Chelsea, 787, 80; second of Nicæa, 787, 83; Frankfort, 794, 81; Clovesho, 803, 87; London, 91; Chelsea, 816, 92; under King Athelstan, 104; Winchester, 112, 114; Calne, 978, 115; Eynsham, 1007, 131; Habam, 1014, 133; Windsor, 1070, 160; Windsor, 1072, 164; London, 1075, 166; Winchester, 1076, *ib.*; Lateran, 1099, 186; London, 1107, 196; London, 1108, 200; Windsor, 1114, 204; Winchester, 1114, 205; London, 1129, 214; Westminster, 1163, 236, 237; Lateran, 1179, 273; Westminster, 1200, 288; Oxford, 1222, 316, 350, 351; London, 1237, 327, 352; Lyons, 1245, 338; Lambeth, 1261, 367; Legate Othobon, 1268, 367; Lyons, 1274, 374; Reading, 1279, 377; Northampton, 1283, 381; Pisa, 499; Constance, 499; Basle, 491, 500
Courtney, Archbishop of Canterbury, Wycliffe before at St. Paul's, 421; Bulls directed to, against Wycliffe, 422; character of, 321; strongly opposed to Wycliffe, *ib.*; summons Convocation to Blackfriars, 1382, 432; orders the Chancellor of Oxford to publish censure of Wycliffe's propositions, 436; holds a meeting of Convocation at Oxford, 439; endeavours to procure sharper law against Lollards, 447; letter of to suffragans, *ib.*; visitations of at Leicester, 450; death of, 456
Courts, Ecclesiastical, grievances from, 491; attempt to suppress by *Præmunire* Statute, 492; declared to be not affected by that statute, 493; vexatious proceedings of, 509; reformed by Archbishop Warham, 509
Crediton, foundation of See of, 103; See of transferred to Exeter, 146
Croyland Abbey, foundation of, 55
Crumpe, Henry, before the Convocation at Oxford, 452

CRUSADE.

Crusade, preparations for, after capture of Jerusalem, 277, 278; Bishop Spencer's, 448
Cunningham, John, opposes Wycliffe, 471
Cuthbert, St., made bishop of Lindisfarne, 62; holy life of, *ib.*; dies at Farne, *ib.*
Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, successor to Nothelm, 76
Cynegilsus, King, disposed to receive Christianity, 47; baptism of, 48

D

Dagan, British bishop, refuses to communicate with Laurentius, 35
Danelagh territory conceded to Danes, 96
Danes, effects of ravages of on Church in time of Ethelred, 134, 135
Daniel, Bishop, succeeds Heddi at Winchester, 70; patron of Boniface, 71
David, St., the national Saint of Wales, 16
Deusdedit, Archbishop, death of, 57
Dilston, battle of, 42
Diuma, Bishop, missionary to Mid-Angles, 50; dies at Repton, *ib.*
Dominicans, the, origin of, 317
Dorchester, See of, foundation of, 48; not in Mercia, 61, note
Dubricius, founder of the Church of Llandaff, 16
Dunstan, Archbishop, work of, 107; treatment of Edwy by, 109; compelled to fly, 110; return of, *ib.*; responsible for the ecclesiastical policy of Edgar, *ib.*; made Archbishop of Canterbury, 111; consecrates bishops, *ib.*; attempts of to enforce celibacy of clergy, 113, 114; opposition to policy of, 114, 115; holds Council at Winchester, 114; at Calne, 115, 116; policy of triumphant, 116; withdraws from public affairs, 116; employment of at close of life, *ib.*; early life of, 121
Dunstable Abbey, unpopularity of with townspeople, 368
Durham, commencement of See of, 146

E

Eadbald, King, refuses to adopt Christianity, 35; death of, 56
Eadbert Prœn attempts to shake off Mercian rule, 85
Eadmer, character of history of, 208, note
Eadnothus II., Bishop, builds the Church of Stow, 147
Eadred, Bishop, gains See of Durham by simony, 142; evil end of, 146
Eadsige, Archbishop, coadjutor-bishop of Ethelnoth, 142; character of, *ib.*; hallows King Edward, 145; death of, 147
Eadwin, King, becomes Bretwalda, 37; marries Ethelburga, *ib.*; hesitation of, about baptism, 37; character of, *ib.*;

EDWARD.

early history of, 38; converted by Paulinus, *ib.*; holds a conference at York, *ib.*; baptism of, 39; assists in planting the Church in Lindsey, 40, 41; defeated and slain at Hatfield, 41
Ealdred, Archbishop, succeeds Lyfing at Worcester, 146; promoted to York, 152; holds Worcester in plurality, *ib.*; accused of simony, *ib.*; journey of to Rome, *ib.*; deposed by the Pope, *ib.*; restored to York, but has to resign Worcester, 153
Eanfleda, wife of Oswy, a Kentish princess, 52
Earconbert, King, succession of, 56; death of, 57
Earconwald, Bishop, consecrated by Theodore, 59; reputation of, for sanctity, 60; founds monasteries, *ib.*
Easter, calculation of, regulated at Arles, 6; calculation of, dispute as to, 17, 52, 53
Easterfield, Council of, 67
Eata, Bishop of Lindisfarne, 61, and note; removal of to Hexham, 62; death of, 66
Eathed, Bishop of Mid-Angles, 61; retires to Ripon, *ib.*
Ebba, Queen of South Saxons, a Christian, 65
Eborius, British bishop at Arles, 6
Eegfrid succeeds Oswy, 38
Eddius appointed by Wilfrid to teach Church music, 64; writer of Life of Wilfrid, *ib.*, note
Edgar, King, succession of, 110; under direction of Dunstan, 111, 114; canons enacted in reign of, 117, 118, 119
Edilwalch, King of South Saxons, baptism of, 65
Edmund, King, martyrdom of, 95, 96
Edmund II., King, valour and death of, 134
Edmund, Bishop, builds minster at Durham, 142
Edmund Rich, Archbishop of Canterbury, overwhelmed by Pope's exactions, 331; retires to Pontigny, 332; character of, *ib.*, and note; *speculum* of, 510
Edmund's, St., monastery of, built by Cnut, 136
Edward (the Elder), King, carries on Church policy of King Alfred, 103
Edward (the Confessor), King, virtuous character of, 144; promotion of foreigners in English Church by, 145; devotion to St. Peter of, 154; builds Westminster Abbey, *ib.*; death and burial of at Westminster, *ib.*; ecclesiastical laws of, 155
Edward I., King, quiet succession of, 369; Church policy of, 375, 380; obtains grant of tenth for Crusade, 383; summons clergy to a General Synod, 384; demands half of their revenues, *ib.*; summons clerical representatives to Parliament, 385; violent contests of with clergy, 387 389; renounces right

to tax clergy without their consent, 391; declaration of barons as to appearing of before Pope, 392; accuses Archbishop before Pope, 393; destructive later policy of, *ib.*; death of, 394
Edward III., King, quarrel of, with Archbishop Stratford, 403; resents Papal intrusions, 404; vigorous measures of to stop Papal provisions, 405; letter of, in defence of liberties of English Church, 406
Edwy, King, opposes the High Church party, 109; violently treated by Dunstan and Odo, *ib.*; tragical end of, 110
Egbercht, succeeds to kingdom of Kent, 57; sends Wighard to Rome, *ib.*
Egbert, Archbishop, letter to from Bede, 73; Archbishop and Metropolitan, 73, 75; consecrates suffragans, 76; penitential of, 79
Egbert, King, Bretwalda, 89; troubled state of his time, 93
Eleutherus, Pope, pretended letter of, to Lucius, 3
Elfgiva, cruel treatment of, by Dunstan and Odo, 110
Elfsy, Archbishop, opposed to policy of Odo, 111; death of, *ib.*
Elmham, See of, transferred to Thetford; 166
Elphege, Archbishop of Canterbury, succeeds to Canterbury, 131; obtains the holding of a council, *ib.*; encourages the citizens of Canterbury against Danes, 132; is captured by Danes, *ib.*; refuses to use Church money for ransom, 133; murder of, *ib.*; disparaged by Lanfranc, upheld by Anselm, 174
Ely, See of, foundation of, 201; given by Pope in commendam, 491
Eorpwald, King, baptism of, 46
Erasmus, patronised by Archbishop Warham, 496; character of work of, 517
Ermenfrid, Legate of Pope, holds a Synod, 160; consecrates Bishop of Winchester, 161
Ethelbert, King of Kent, Bretwalda, 19; married to Bertha, a Christian princess, 20; baptism of, 23; liberal presents of, to the Church, 24; gives up his palace to the Christian clergy, 29; letter to, from Gregory, 28; builds a Church at Rochester, 32; death of, 35
Ethelburga marries Eadwin, 37; has Paulinus for chaplain, *ib.*; escapes with Paulinus into Kent, 42
Ethelfrid, King, slaughter of the monks of Bangor by, 31
Ethelheard, Archbishop, consecration of, 82; unpopularity of in Kent, 85; obliged to fly into Mercia, *ib.*; restored by Kenulf, *ib.*; reproved by Alcuin, *ib.*; journey of to Rome, 86; success of, 87; restored to rights as Metropolitan, *ib.*; death of, 90
Ethelnoth, Archbishop, promoted to primacy, 139; gives relic of St. Augustine to Leofric and Godiva, 140; makes a claim for primacy of Scandinavian Church, 136

Ethelred, King, holds council at Eynsham, 131; flight and return of, 133; holds council at Habam, *ib.*
Ethelwold, Bishop, made bishop of Winchester, 111; proceedings of in putting monks in place of canons, 111, 112, 113
Ethelwulf, King, devastations of Danes in his time, 93; gains success over Danes, *ib.*; makes grant of tithes to the Church, 94; nature of the grant, *ib.*; goes to Rome, *ib.*; conspiracy against, *ib.*; foundations of at Rome, 95; procures coronation of his son Alfred, *ib.*
Ethered, Archbishop, restores monks to Christ Church, 96
Eugenius III., Pope, unfair treatment of St. William by, 226; calls council at Rheims, 227
Eugenius IV., Pope, gives See of Ely to be held *in commendam*, 491; character of, 499
Eusebius, passages of, relating to Christianity in Britain, 4, 5
Evesham Abbey, foundation of, 55
Excommunication, *ipso facto* beginning of, 288
Exeter, commencement of See of, 146
Expectatives, nature of, 508
Eynsham, Council of, 131

F

Fastidius, British bishop, favours Pelagianism, 11 and note
Felix, Bishop, sent for to convert East Anglia, 47; establishes See at Dunwich, *ib.*; part converter of East Anglia, 51
Finan, St., baptizes Peada, 49; sends missionaries to Mercia, *ib.*
Flambard, Ralph, Bishop, organises system of simony, 176, 177, 186; made bishop of Durham, 186
Foliot, Gilbert, bishop of London, opposes Becket's election, 233; translated to London from Hereford, 234; proclamation of, against Becket at Northampton, 243; writes letter of remonstrance to Becket, 248; sermon of at the penance of Henry II., 265
Fordun, church at, 13
Formosus, Pope, displeased at long vacancy of English Sees, 102
Fountains Abbey, foundation of, 214; plants daughter-houses, 215; wealth and luxury of, *ib.*
Franciscans, the, origin of, 317; learning of the English, 505; great scholars produced by, 505, note
Frankfort, Council of, English bishops at, 84; decrees of, *ib.*; great importance of, 85
Friars, the, first appearance of, in England, 317; corruption of, 318; new

orders of forbidden at Lyons, 374, and note; growth and exactions of, 419; waning popularity of, 452; compelled to contend against Lollards, *ib.*; decay of, 504
Fursey, Monk, part converter of East Anglia, 51

G

Gascoigne, Thomas, *Dictionary of Theology* of, 473; charges of against bishops, *ib.*, 474
Gaunt, John of, supports Wycliffe on account of his opinions on Church property, 417, 420; defends him before the bishops at St. Paul's, 421; convocation resists dictation of, 420; support of unfortunate for Wycliffe, 425; refuses support to Herford and Repyngdon, 437
Geoffrey, Archbishop of York, nominated to York, 280; violent proceedings of, 281, 284; proceedings against at York, 285; suspended by Pope, *ib.*
Gerard, Archbishop, called upon to consecrate in lieu of Anselm, 192
Germanus, Bishop, called into Britain to oppose Pelagianism, 11; at Verulamium, *ib.*; visits Britain a second time, 12; at the Hallelujah battle, *ib.*; overthrows Pelagianism, *ib.*
Giffard, William, Bishop, allowed to receive the staff from Anselm, 192; refuses to be consecrated by Gerard, 193; possessions of forfeited and banished, *ib.*
Gildas, assertions of as to beginning of Christianity in Britain, 1; a writer of the sixth century, 2; does not mention Lucius, 3; mistake of as to Arianism in Britain, 7; asserts existence of Churches in later Roman Britain, 12; knows nothing of Germanus, *ib.*, note; account of the Christians in Wales and Cornwall of, 14, 15, 16
Gisa, Bishop, strengthens the canons at Wales, 152; journey of to Rome, 153
Glastonbury, the oldest monastery in Britain, 2, 54; enriched by Aldhelm, 71; Anglo-Saxon Church at, *ib.*; gives seven primates to English Church, 139; violent proceedings at, under Thurstan, 174
Godiva, benefactress to Church at Coventry, 140
Good Friday, directions as to mass of, 127; first order as to observance of day of, 401
Gratian, compilation of *Decretum* by, 224
Gregory, Pope (The Great), writes to kings of Franks as to the English, 20; determines to send mission to England, *ib.*; the story of the English boys seen by him, 21; personal attempt of, to go to England, *ib.*; sends Augustine and his companions, *ib.*; refuses to let them return, *ib.*; answers of to Augustine's questions, 24, 25; letter of to Eulogius on the conversion of the English, 26;

wise advice of to Augustine as to the heathen ceremonies, 27; arrangement of Sees for England of, *ib.*; letter of to Ethelbert and Bertha, 28; to Augustine to caution him against pride, *ib.*
Gregory VII., Pope, homage refused to by William I., 170; anger of with Archbishop Lanfranc, *ib.*
Gregory IX., Pope, exacts money for war with the Emperor, 321; anger of, at the proceedings of the Lewythiel, 322; appoints Edmund Rich to Canterbury, 324; orders a visitation of monasteries, *ib.*; demands 300 English benefices, 331
Gregory XI., Pope, issues Bulls against Wycliffe, 422
Grimbald, teacher of Alfred, 100, 101
Grosseteste, Robert, Bishop of Lincoln, succession of to episcopate, 325; character of, *ib.*; defends the Oxford students, 328; welcomes appointment of Boniface, 335; opposes appointment of Robert Passelew, 336; goes to Council of Lyons, 338; obtains sentence against his chapter, *ib.*; undertakes to collect tax for Pope, 339; signs the cession of King John, *ib.*; defends himself against the king, *ib.*; driven to oppose Roman exactions, 341; goes a second time to Lyons, 342; sermon of against abuses of Court of Rome, 342, 343; vigorous reforming measures of, 344; leads opposition to king's demands for subsidies, 345; makes calculation of revenues of foreigners in England, *ib.*; refuses to induct Pope's nephew to a prebend, 346; letter of to Papal commissioners, *ib.*; said to have been excommunicated, 348; letter of to people of England, *ib.*; death of, 350; orders preaching of sermons in English, 510; *Castel of Love* of, 512
Gundulf, Bishop, substitutes monks for canons at Rochester, 172
Guthrun, baptism and settlement of, 96, 98

H

Habam, Council of, 133
Hakington, Collegiate Church of, projected, 276; demolished, 277
Hallam, Bishop, deputy of English Church at Pisa and Constance, 499, 507; denounces immorality prevalent in Church, 499
Hallelujah battle, 12
Hampole, Richard de, writings of, 442, 510, 512
Harold, King, great influence of, under Edward, 150; protects Malmesbury Abbey, *ib.*; founds Waltham for prebendaries, 151; dispute of with Bishop Gisa, 151, 152
Harvey, William, sentenced to perpetual imprisonment, 468
Hatfield, Battle of, 633, 41

HATFIELD.

Hatfield, Council of, 62; accepts canons of Lateran Council, *ib.*
Heddi, Bishop, opposes division of See of Winchester, 70; death of, *ib.*
Henry I., King, succession of, 187; charter of, *ib.;* first relations of with Anselm, 188; demands homage from Anselm, *ib.;* refuses to submit to the Pope's directions, 188, 189; at Council of London, 189; invests clerks in Sees, *ib.;* anger of at Anselm refusing to consecrate, 192; demands that Anselm should accept the customs of the fathers, 193; refuses to look at the Pope's letters, *ib.;* sends Anselm to Rome, *ib.;* makes advances to Anselm, 194; exacts money from the clergy for allowance to have wives, 195; keeps Canterbury vacant five years, 204; will not promote men of English race, *ib.;* refuses to allow Papal Legate to enter England, 205; dismisses the Legate Peter from England, 207
Henry II., King, succession and policy of, 231; appoints Thomas Becket primate, 232; demands that Becket should resign the archdeaconry, 234; quarrel of with Becket at Woodstock, 235; holds council at Westminster, 1163, 236; goes away in anger from Westminster Council, 237; partial reconciliation of with Becket, 238; summons Council of Clarendon, *ib.;* rage of against Becket for refusing Constitutions of Clarendon, 239; applies to the Pope to make Archbishop of York Legate, 246; summons council at Northampton, 241; harsh treatment by of Becket at Northampton, 242, 243; sends letter to King of France against Becket, 244; embassy of to the Pope at Sens, 245; outrage by on Becket's dependants, 246; forbids any to communicate with or pray for Becket, 247; drives Becket from Pontigny, 248; reconciled with Becket at Freteval, 249; outburst of anger of against Becket, 251; dismay of at murder of Becket, 252; penance of at Avranches, *ib.;* promises to abrogate Constitutions of Clarendon, 253; refers the election to Canterbury to the Pope, 264; penance of at shrine of St. Thomas, 265, 266; obtains cession of clerical privileges from Cardinal Hugo, 269; nominates his son Geoffrey to See of Lincoln, *ib.;* foundation of three Abbeys by, 272
Henry III., King, promises tenth of revenue to Pope, 320; allows clergy to be unjustly taxed, 321; invites Papal Legate to England, 326; writes to Pope Innocent to deprecate exactions, 337; opposes the Pope's exactions, 340; checked in his demands for aid by Bishop Grosseteste, 345; accepts Sicily for his son Edmund, 357; appeals to Convocation for money, 360; character of, 370
Henry, Bishop of Winchester, brother of

HUGO.

King Stephen, 218; supports Stephen's cause, *ib.;* Legate of the Pope, 223; holds council and summons King Stephen, *ib.;* consecrates Thomas Becket, 233
Hereford, foundation of See of, 61
Herfast, Bishop, nominated to See of Elmham, 160
Herford, Nicholas, supporter of Wycliffe at Oxford, 435; suspended by the Chancellor, 437; appeals to John of Gaunt, *ib.;* before Convocation of Canterbury, *ib.;* excommunicated, 439; recants, *ib.*
Herlot sent by Pope to exact money, 362
Hermann, Bishop, attempts to secularise Abbey of Malmesbury, 150; retires abroad, *ib.;* made Bishop of Sherborne, 151, note; transfers united Sees to Salisbury, *ib.*
Hertford, Council of, 59
Hervey, Bishop, first Welsh bishop who attended an English Synod, 190, note; first bishop of Ely, 201; account of him by William of Malmesbury, 202
Higbert, Archbishop of Lichfield, made a Metropolitan by Offa, 80; takes precedence of Archbishop of Canterbury, *ib.;* resigns his Metropolitan dignity, 88, note
Hilary, St., asserts orthodoxy of British Church, 7
Hilary, Bishop of Chichester, words of at Council of Westminster, recommends Becket to submit, 242; bad Latin of at Sens, 245 and note
Hilda, Abbess, at the Whitby Conference, 52; sketch of life of, 55
Hoke, Robert, burning of, in 1425, 467
Homage to be done by clerks for temporalties, 196
Honorius I., Pope, sends Palls to Paulinus and Honorius, 41
Honorius, Archbishop of Canterbury, consecrated by Paulinus at Lincoln, 41; consecrates successor to Paulinus at Rochester, 57
Honorius III., Pope, demands prebends and monks' portions, 318; fails to obtain his demand of English Church, 318, 319, 320
Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury, appointed Bishop of Salisbury, 280; Archbishop of Canterbury, 281; Chief Justiciary, *ib.;* quarrel of, with Christ Church Monastery, 282; begins college at Lambeth, *ib.;* obliged by Pope to demolish the college, 283; holds Council at York as Legate, 285; obliged to resign office of Chief Justiciary, 287; holds Council at Westminster, *ib.*
Hugh, St., Bishop of Lincoln, character of, 281, 282; refuses to publish Archbishop Geoffrey's suspension, 285; translation of, 314, 315
Hugo, Cardinal, mission of to England, 268; agrees to surrender clerical privileges, 269

I

Image-worship approved by second Council of Nicæa, 83
Ina, King, laws of in support of the Church, 69; benefactions of to churches, 76
Indulgences, nature of, 515; great abuses of, *ib.*, note
Innocent III., Pope, importance of character in history, 286, 287, 289; orders clergy to resign secular offices, 287; appeals to, in the matter of the Canterbury election, 290; compels the election of Stephen Langton, 291; letter of to King John as to Langton's election, 293; orders three bishops to pronounce an interdict, 295
Innocent IV., Pope, letter of to clergy, bidding them contribute to the king, 337; sends the Nuncio Martin to prey upon English clergy, 337; summons Council at Lyons, 1245, 338; exactions of from English clergy, 336, 339, 340, 341; appoints his nephew to a prebend at Lincoln, 345; said to have excommunicated Bishop Grosseteste, 348
Innocent VIII., Pope, Bull of on monasteries, 1489, 503
Interdict laid on England in ninth century, 91; of Archbishop Theobald, 228; of Innocent III. under John, 295; nature and effects of, 295, 296, 304; removal of, 1214, 310
Investitures, Lay, question of at Lateran Council, 1099, 187; Pope Paschal forbids, 188; exercised by Henry I., 189; Anselm refuses to consent to, 188, 192, 193, 194; debated in Council of London, 196; compromise as to, *ib.*, 197
Ithamar, Bishop, consecrated to Rochester by Honorius, 57

J

Jaenbert, Archbishop, gives up part of his province to Lichfield, 80; death of, 82
James, Deacon, assists Paulinus in baptizing, 40; left by Paulinus at York, 42; labours to uphold Christianity, *ib.*; at the Conference at Whitby, 52
Jaruman, Bishop of the Mid-Angles, 50
Jerome, St., implies that Britons were in the habit of making pilgrimages to Palestine, 7; controversy of with Pelagius, 8, 10
John, Cardinal of Crema, character of his reception as Legate, 209; owed his favour to political causes, 210; presides in Council at Westminster, *ib.*; vicious habits of, 211, note
John De Gray, Bishop of Norwich, elected to Canterbury, 290; election of quashed by the Pope, 291
John, King, procures the election of John de Gray to Canterbury, 290; appeals to the Pope, *ib.*; anger of, at the Pope's action with regard to Stephen Langton, 292, 293, 294; fury of at the pronouncing of the interdict, 295, 297, 298; excommunication of, 298; seizes hostages after his excommunication, *ib.*; oppressions of, 299, 300; interview of with Pandulf, 300; yields to the Pope, 301; makes cession of his kingdom to Pope Innocent, 302; vengeance of on Peter of Wakefield, *ib.*; absolution of at Winchester, 303; checked in vindictive proceedings by Langton, 306; repeats his cession of the Crown, 308; promises compensation to clergy, 308, 309; supported by Pope against clergy, 309, 312; forced to sign the Great Charter, 310; obtains dispensations from his promises, 310, 311; violent proceedings of against clergy, 312, 313; death of, 313
John, precentor, brought over by Benedict to teach Church music, 72
John, presbyter, teacher of Alfred, 100, 101
John Scot (Erigena), not connected with Alfred, 101, 102
Joseph of Arimathea, legend of, 2
Julius, martyred at Caerleon, 4
Justus, Archbishop of Canterbury, sent by Gregory to England, 26; first bishop of Rochester, 32; retires to France, 35; succeeds Mellitus as archbishop, 36; consecrates Romanus to Rochester, 37

K

Kemp, Cardinal, anti-national policy of, 493; promotion of, 494; governs Church as Legate *à latere*, *ib.*
Kenilworth, dictum of, declares Church free, 369
Kent, Christianity of, due to Roman sources, 81
Kenulf, King, restores Archbishop Ethelheard, 85; letter of to the Pope as to restoring Canterbury, 86; quarrel of with Archbishop Wulfred, 91; brings about the laying of the land under interdict, *ib.*
Kilwardby, Archbishop of Canterbury, consecration of, 373; character of, 374; attends Council of Lyons, *ib.*; made a cardinal and Bishop of Porto, 376

L

Lactantius, passage of, relating to Christianity in Britain, 4, 5
Lambeth, college of, building of, 282; demolished, 283
Lanfranc, Archbishop, chosen by King and Council for primate, 161; early life of, *ib.*; informed by Papal Legates of promotion, *ib.*; unwillingness of to accept it, *ib.*; elected and consecrated, *ib.*; requires oath of submission from Thomas of York, 162; consecrates him with an understanding, *ib.*; goes to

Rome, *ib.*; obtains dispensation for Thomas and Remigius, 163; honour paid to by Pope, *ib.*; defends primacy of Canterbury, 164; rebuilds Canterbury Cathedral, 165; obtains canon as to clerical matrimony, 166; exhibits spirit of independence towards Rome, 170; threatened by Pope Gregory, *ib.*; policy of in making cathedrals monastic, 171
Langland, William, *Piers Plowman*, visions of, by, 511, 512
Langton, Simon de, upholds his brother's cause at Rome, 309; elected to York, but not accepted by Pope, 312
Langton, Stephen, Cardinal, Archbishop of Canterbury, election of to Canterbury forced on by the Pope, 219; obtains privileges for monasteries during the interdict, 299; comes to England to negotiate, *ib.*; comes to England as primate, 303; pronounces absolution of King John, *ib.*; stops the vindictive proceedings of King John, 306; promulgates the charter of Henry I., *ib.*; good service of in the matter of Great Charter, 310; refuses to excommunicate the barons, 312; suspended by the Pope, *ib.*; carries out translation of St. Thomas, 315; holds Council at Oxford, 316; baffles the demands of the Pope, 319; death of, 320
Laurentius, Archbishop of Canterbury, consecrated by Augustine as successor, 32; attempts to bring Scotch and Irish bishops to conformity, 34; designs to retire to France, 35; vision, and alleged chastisement of, 36; interview of with Eadbald, 26; death of, *ib.*
Law, canon, introduction of, into England, 224; text books of, *ib.*, note; Gratian's compilation of, *ib.*
Laws, ecclesiastical, of King Alfred, 96, 97, 98, 99; of King Athelstan, 103, 104; at Eynsham, 1007, 131; at Habam, 133; of King Cnut, 137, 138; of Edward the Confessor, 155
Legends as to commencement of Christianity in Britain, 2
Leicester, foundation of See of, 61
Leo III., Pope, letter of, to King Kenulf, 86; acquiesces in the restoration of the rights of Canterbury, 87; remonstrance of English clergy to, 90; sends Pall to Wulfred, *ib.*; endeavours to compose the quarrel between king and primate, 91; inflicts, or permits, a six years' interdict of England, *ib.*
Leofric adorns church at Coventry, 140
Leofric, Bishop, upholds seculars against regulars, 146; succeeds Lyfing at Crediton, *ib.*; transfers the See to Exeter, *ib.*
Lepers, hospital for, founded by Remigius, 173
Leutherius, Bishop, sent by Agilbert to Wessex, 49; consecrated by Theodore, *ib.*

Lewythiel, the, origin and proceedings of, 322; plead their cause at Rome, 330
Lichfield, See of, limitation of, 61; constituted a Metropolitan See, 80; reduced to the condition of a suffragan, 87; transferred to Chester, 166
Lincoln, See of, See of Dorchester transferred to, 165, 166; cathedral church built in, *ib.*; Geoffrey nominated to, 269; long vacancy of, 270, note
Lincoln, Chapter of, dispute of with Bishop Grosseteste, 338, 339
Lindisfarne, foundation of, 54
Lindsey, conversions in by Paulinus, 40; foundation of See of, 61, and note
Liturgical uses, various in the early Church, 24; the Sarum, 173
Liturgy of ancient British Church, 17
Liuthard, Bishop, chaplain to Queen Bertha, 20
Lollards, immunity of at first, 446; new law projected against, 447; rapid increase of, *ib.*; character of, 448; movement against in Parliament of 1388, 450; King's commands concerning, *ib.*; at Leicester, opinions of, *ib.*; penance inflicted on, 451; rapid increase of, 452; boldness of, in 1394, 454; twelve tenets of, 454, 455; menaces of king against, 456; letters of Pope against, *ib.*; rebellious movements of, 466; stricter laws against, *ib.*; executions of, 466, 467; tenets of invited animadversion, 469; harsh and unjust treatment of, *ib.*; proceedings of Council of Constance against, 470; penetrated to Bohemia, *ib.*, note; literary opponents of, 471
London designated as the See of a Metropolitan, 27; foundation of the See of, 30; churches built in, 32
Longchamp, William, appointed bishop of Ely, 279; Chief Justiciary, 280
Losinga, Herbert de, Bishop, simony of, 182, and note
Lotharingians promoted by King Edward, 145
Lucius, King, legend of, 3
Lupus, Bishop, accompanies Germanus to Britain, 11
Lyfing, Archbishop of Canterbury, flies from England, 133; never receives Pall from Rome, 139
Lyfing, Bishop, made bishop of Worcester, 142; influence of, 144, 145; bishop of Crediton, 144

M

Malmesbury, Abbey of, attempts on, by Hermann, 150; protected by Earl Harold, *ib.*
Mangym, Ralph, sentenced to perpetual imprisonment, 468
Marshall, Henry, appointed Dean of York when not in orders, 280

Martin, Papal Nuncio sent to England, 337 ; proceedings of, 338
Martin V., Pope, character of, 485 ; infringement of English liberties by, 486 ; checked by English law, *ib.* ; anger of, against Archbishop Chichele, *ib.* ; calls upon Archbishops of Canterbury and York to disobey the law, 486 ; calls upon Chichele to get repeal of statutes, 487 ; letter of to King and Parliament against Premunire Statute, 488 ; reiterates demands to Archbishop Chichele, 489 ; appoints Henry Beaufort Legate, 490
Martin, St., Church of, at Canterbury, 20, 23
Maserfield, battle of, 43
Mass Book, the Lay-folk's, 511
Matrimony, clerical, general in tenth century, 107, 113 ; discouraged at Eynsham, 131 ; different rules as to, for secular and capitular clergy, 166 ; prohibited by Synod of Westminster, 1102, 190, and note ; allowance of for money, 195 ; not diminished by canon of 1102, 200 ; council to put down, 1108, *ib.* ; forbidden by canons of 1127, 213 ; by Council of London, 1129, 214 ; permission for sold by the king, *ib.*
Medeshampstede, Peterborough, first abbot of, 60
Mellitus, Archbishop of Canterbury, sent by Gregory to England, 26 ; charged with a special message by Gregory, 27 ; first bishop of London, 32 ; expelled from London, 35 ; retires to France, *ib.* ; attends synod at Rome as bishop of London, *ib.* ; succeeds Laurentius as Archbishop, 36 ; stoppage of a conflagration by prayer of, *ib.* ; death of, *ib.*
Mepham, Simon de, Archbishop of Canterbury, character of, 400 ; holds provincial synod, 401 ; Constitutions of, *ib.*, 402 ; visitation of, 402 ; checked at Exeter, 403 ; quarrel of with Canterbury monks, *ib.*
Mercia, planting of Church in, 40 ; overthrow of Christianity in, 41, 42 ; re-establishment of Church in, 49 ; conversion of, due to British sources, 51
Merton, Convocation of, 362
Messina, Archbishop, in Parliament asks money for the Pope, 360
Michel, Dan, of Northgate, *Remorse of Conscience* of, 511
Monasteries, early foundation of, 60 ; corruption of manners in, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 89 ; destruction of by Danes, 95, 106 ; spared by Danes in later invasions, 122 ; rebuilt and endowed by Cnut, 136 ; plundered by William I., 158 ; rebuilt after Conquest, 174 ; of the Cistercians, 215 ; rapid building of in Stephen's time, 225 ; exemptions granted to, 258 ; foundation of by Henry II., 272 ; visitation of ordered by Gregory IX., 324 ; lay attacks upon, 368 ; fall of into disrepute, 502 ; bull of Pope Innocent on immorality of, 503
Monothelitism, rejected by Council of Hatfield, 62
Montfort, Simon de, leader of baronial party, 342 ; reverence of clergy for, 364, 365 ; summons a Parliament, 366 ; death of, *ib.*
Mortmain, first statute of, 378 ; grievance of felt by clergy, 379
Morton, Cardinal, Archbishop of Canterbury, character of, 495, and note ; Papalises Church of England, *ib.* ; complains of irregularity of clergy, 502 ; letter of, to abbot of St. Alban's, 503
Murdak, Henry, Archbishop, consecrated in place of St. William, 226

N

Netter, Thomas, opposes Wycliffe's doctrines, 471
Nicæa, first Council of, British bishops probably present at, 6 ; second Council of, 83
Nicholas IV., Pope, grants of revenue by, to king, 383 ; valuation of clerical incomes ordered by, *ib.*
Nicholas V., Pope, obtains an increase of authority in England, 493
Nidd, the Council of, 67
Nigel, Bishop of Ely, holds Castle of Devizes against Stephen, 222 ; forced to surrender, *ib.*
Ninian, St., work of in Galloway, 13 ; converts Southern Picts, 13 ; visits St. Martin at Tours, *ib.*
Nonant, Hugh, Bishop, character of, 280 ; quarrel of with monks of Coventry, 283
Northumbria, conversion of, due chiefly to British sources, 51
Norwich, See of Thetford transferred to, 166, 182
Norwich Abbey, attack on, by townspeople, 368, 369
Nothelm, Archbishop, a secular clerk before consecration, 75 ; consecrates suffragans, *ib.* ; death of, *ib.*

O

Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, early life of, 107, 108 ; made Archbishop of Canterbury, 108 ; becomes a monk, *ib.* ; restores Canterbury Cathedral, *ib.* ; publishes canons, *ib.* ; addresses synodical epistle to bishops, 109 ; severity of, *ib.* ; dealings of with Edwy and Elfgiva, 109, 110 ; great power of, *ib.* ; death of, *ib.*
Odo, Prior of Christ Church, demands free election of archbishop, 261, 263 ; goes to the king in Normandy, 262 ; one of the persons selected for primacy, 263
Offa, King, friendship of, with Charle-

magne, 79; raises Lichfield to a Metropolitan See, 80; holds a council at Chelsea, 787, *ib.*; obtains the Pall for Bishop Higbert, *ib.*
Oldcastle, Sir John, trial of ordered by Convocation, 463; will not be convinced by king, *ib.*; arrested and lodged in Tower, 464; confession of, *ib.*, 465; pronounced heretical, 466; escape of from Tower, *ib.*; capture and execution of, 1417, 468; forged recantation of, *ib.*
Origen, passages of relating to Christianity in Britain, 4
Orlton, Adam, bishop, trial of before Secular Court, 398, 399; probably implicated in king's murder, 399, and note; obtains See of Winchester, 403
Ornaments of Church and ministers, 125, 126
Osmund, St., Bishop, learning of, 172; *Custom-book* of, 173; general adoption of book of, *ib.*, note
Oswald, King, defeats Cadwallader at Dilston, 42; sets up a cross on field of battle, *ib.*; king of both Northumbrian provinces, *ib.*; sends to Iona for Christian teachers, 43; supports the Church in Northumbria, *ib.*; slain by Penda at Maserfield, *ib.*; marries daughter of Cynegilsus, 48
Oswald, Archbishop, made Bishop of Worcester, 112; introduces Benedictine rule, *ib.*; translated to York, 112; activity of ceases, *ib.*
Oswin, humility and devotion of, 43; slain by Oswy, *ib.*
Oswy, King, succession of to throne, 43; puts to death Oswin, *ib.*; attacks King Penda, *ib.*; defeats and slays him at Wingfield, 44, 49; gives Peada his daughter in marriage, 49; uses his influence to restore Christianity among East Saxons, 50; holds Conference at Whitby, 52, 53; joins with Egbercht in sending Wighard to Rome, 57; requests Pope Vitalian to provide an archbishop, *ib.*; death of, 58
Otho, Cardinal, comes as Legate to demand benefices, 318; failure and recall of, 319; comes again as Legate, 326; holds Council of London, 327; proceedings at Oxford in connection with, 328; refuses to leave England, 330; departure of, from England, 334; Constitutions of, 352
Othobon, Cardinal, mission of to England to punish clergy, 366; Constitutions of, 367
Oxford, University of, outrage on, by King John, 298; desertion of by students, 299; students of defended by Grosseteste, 328; Wycliffe's opinions popular at, 423, 435, 437; representation of as to clergy, 500, 501, 502
Oxford, Council of, 316; Parliament of, 363

P

Palladius attempts to convert the Irish, 13
Pandulf, interview of with King John, 300; sent to offer King Phillip the crown of England, 301; receives the submission of King John, *ib.*; upholds John's cause with the Pope against Langton, 309
Paris, Matthew, dark pictures by of state of the Church, 313, 325, 334
Parliament, of Westminster, 1248, 341; of Oxford, resists King and Pope, 363; provisions of the Oxford, 364; of 1344, regulates proceedings against clergy, 406; checks Papal intrusions, 408; of 1351, passes first Statute of Provisors, 408; of 1371, opposition to the Church in, 417; "The Good" (1376), anti-papal feeling in, 418; petitions to, against Roman intrusions, *ib.*; of Gloucester, rejects measures for Church spoliation, 426; of 1388, petitions against Lollards, 450; of 1394, Lollard opinions in, 454; of 1404, discusses forfeiture of Church property, 461; of 1410, puts forth a scheme for confiscating Church revenues, 461, 462; declaration by, in 1399, against Pope's jurisdiction, 484, and note
Parochial System, introduced by Theodore, 63; operation of, after Theodore's death, 68
Paschal II., Pope, anger of, with English Church for its independent action, 204, 205
Patrick, St., converts the Irish, 13
Paul, St., the assertion that he preached Christianity in Britain, 2, 3
Paulinus, Archbishop of York, sent by Gregory to England, 26; accompanies Ethelburga to Northumbria, 37; converts King Eadwin, 38; first archbishop of York, 39; baptizes large numbers in Bernicia and Deira, 40; converts men of Lindsey, *ib.*; baptizes many in the Trent, *ib.*; builds a church at Lincoln, 41; consecrates Honorius Archbishop of Canterbury, *ib.*; appearance of, described, 40, note; escapes into Kent after battle of Hatfield, 42; becomes bishop of Rochester, *ib.*; death of, *ib.*
Peada, son of Penda, desires to marry Oswy's daughter, 49; is converted to Christianity, *ib.*; baptized by St. Finan, 49; brings four priests with him into Mercia, *ib.*
Peccham, John de, Archbishop of Canterbury, promotion of to Primacy, 376; holds council at Reading (1279), 377; obliged to recall anathemas of Reading, 377; summons convocation of Lambeth, 379; bold measures of, *ib.*; retracted, *ib.*; violent letter of, against exempt orders, 380; ordered by king to call provincial council, *ib.*; summons convocation (1283), 381; Constitutions of,

at Reading, 411; at Lambeth, *ib.*, 412; orders preaching of sermons in English, 510
Pecock, Reginald, Bishop, literary opponent of Lollards, 471; sermon of at Paul's Cross, 472; offence taken at, by bishops, *ib.*; trial of by Archbishop Stafford, 472; *Repressor of over-much Blaming the Clergy* of, 474; *Treatise on Faith* of, 475, 476; books of, given to a committee to examine, 478; declared heretical, *ib.*; recantation of, 479, 480; ill-treatment and imprisonment of, 481; defence of pilgrimages by, 514
Pelagius, a British monk, 7; account of, 8, 9, 10
Pelagianism, in Britain, 10; introduced by Agricola, *ib.*; Gallic bishops called in to oppose, 11; condemned at Verulamium, *ib.*; revival of, 12, overthrown by Germanus and Severus, *ib.*
Pelagianism, semi-, its nature, 11, note
Pelagians, condemned by African Synod, 10; acquitted at Diospolis, *ib.*; Pope Zosimus favours, *ib.*; banished by Court of Ravenna, *ib.*
Penda, King, defeats King Eadwin at Hatfield, 41; defeats Oswald at Maserfield, 43; defeated and slain at Wingfield, 44, 49; statements of Bede concerning, 46, note; takes away territory from Wessex, 47
Peter, sent to England as Legate, 207; not allowed to remain, *ib.*
Peter de Aqua Blanca, Bishop of Hereford, envoy of the king in Italy, 357; fraudulent transaction of, at Rome, *ib.*; thrown into prison by barons, 365
Peter's Pence, amount of tax of, 513, and note
Pilgrimages, enjoined as necessary for laymen, 513, 514; the favourite in England, *ib.*; defence of, by Bishop Pecock, *ib.*
Pipewell Abbey, Council of, 279
Pisa, Council of, 499
Plegmund, Archbishop, teacher of Alfred, 100; made Archbishop of Canterbury, 101; consecration of seven bishops by, 102, 103, note
Poems, alliterative, 512
Poiset, Hugh de, Bishop of Durham, character of, 280
Pomponia Græcina, mentioned by Tacitus, may have been a dweller in Britain, 3
Popes, the, of fifteenth century, bad character of, 499
Præmunire, first Statute of (1353), 409, 410; Second Statute of 1393, 453, 454
Præmunientes, clause in bishops' writs, 385
Primer, the, contents and character of, 513
Proctors, of clergy, before Parliament, 358, 359; ordered by Council of Reading, 377, note; first attend Convocation in 1283, 381; resist king's demand in 1249, 384; heavy demands made on, in 1294, 384; threatened with violence, *ib.*
Prohibitions of ecclesiastical courts complained of, 381, 382; checked and regulated, 466
Provisors, first Statute of (1351), 408; Ordinance of (1352), 409; Act of, of 1390, 453; protest of archbishops against, *ib.*
Pudens, mentioned by St. Paul, 2; a British name, 3, note
Purveye, John, Recantation of, 459; indifferent character of, *ib.*
Putta, Bishop, transferred from Rochester to Hereford, 61

R

Raleigh, William, Bishop of Norwich, obtains See of Winchester, 335
Ralph, Archbishop of Canterbury, election of to Canterbury, 204; receives the Pall, 205; sent to the Pope to remonstrate against appointment of Legate, 205; refuses to consecrate Thurstan without profession of obedience, 206; death and character of, 208
Ramsbury, foundation of See of, 103
Redwald, King, defeats Ethelfrid, 38; baptism of, 46; endeavours to unite heathen and Christian rites, *ib.*
Remigius, made Bishop of Dorchester, 157, 158; charges of simony against, *ib.*; consecrated by Stigand, 157; goes to Rome with Lanfranc, 162; obtains papal pardon for simony, 163; transfers the See to Lincoln, 165; date of the transfer, 166, and note; builds cathedral at Lincoln, 165; vigorous administration of diocese by, 173
Repyngdon, Cardinal, supporter of Wycliffe at Oxford, 435; sermon of on Corpus Christi day, 435, 436; suspended from scholastical acts, 437; appeals to John of Gaunt, *ib.*; before the Convocation of Canterbury, 437; excommunicated, 439; recants, *ib.*; after promotion of, *ib.*
Reservation to English Sees commenced by the Pope, 395
Restitutus, British bishop at Arles, 6
Reynolds, Archbishop, provision of, by Pope, 396; antecedents of, *ib.*; rights of patronage conferred on, 397; character and death of, 400
Rimini, Council of, British bishops at, 7; their poverty, *ib.*
Richard of Dover, Archbishop of Canterbury, elected to Primacy, 263; appealed against by younger Henry, 264; goes to the Pope at Anagni, 264; consecration of, by Pope, *ib.*; enthroned at Canterbury when church in ruins, 266; consecrates four bishops, *ib.*; holds a synod at Westminster, 267; character of, 273; letter of on immunities of clergy, *ib.*; death of, 274
Richard (le Grand), Archbishop of Canterbury, appointment of by Pope, 320

Richard, St., Bishop of Chichester, appointed Chancellor by Boniface, 335; Bishop of Chichester, 336; character of, 370
Richard I., King, succession of, 279; coronation of, *ib.*; holds council at Pipewell, *ib.*; nominates to Church appointments, 280
Richard II., threatens Lollards, 456; banishes Archbishop Arundel, *ib.*; charged with applying to Pope for confirmation of his Acts, 484
Rigge, Dr., Chancellor of Oxford, supporter of Wycliffe at Oxford, 431, 435; summoned before Convocation of Canterbury, 436; yields to the archbishop, 437; suspends Herford and Repyngdon, *ib.*
Robert, Archbishop of Canterbury, bishop of London, 145; director of King Edward, *ib.*; made Archbishop of Canterbury, 148; unpopularity of, *ib.*; refuses to consecrate Spearhafoc, *ib.*; driven into exile, *ib.*; appeals to the Pope, 149
Rochester, foundation of See of, 32
Roger, Bishop of Salisbury, consecration of, 197; Justiciary of England, 218; favours Stephen's claims, *ib.*; seized by King Stephen, 221; castles built by, *ib.*
Roger, Archbishop of York, attempt of, to take precedence of Archbishop of Canterbury, 270, 271
Romanus consecrated to Rochester, 37
Ruffinianus sent by Gregory to England, 26
Rustand sent by Pope to collect money for crusade, 358; exactions of, 359

S

Sacerdos, British Presbyter at Arles, 6
Saints of English race despised by Normans, 174
Salisbury, commencement of See of, 151, note
Sanctuary, regulations of, 97; power of different churches as to, 137; disregarded in Stephen's time, 225
Sardica, Council of, British bishops perhaps present at, 6
Sawtry, William, before convocation, 457; condemned as heretical, 458; burned at Smithfield, *ib.*
Saxons, East, Church planted among, 31; Christianity re-introduced from British sources, 51
Saxons, South, conversion of, 65, 66; in diocese of Winchester, 66
Saxulf, Bishop, consecrated by Theodore, 59; first abbot of Medeshampstede, 60; bishop of Lichfield, 59, 61
Scripture, rhyming manuals of, 512
Scot, John (Erigena), account of, 105
Sebert, King of East Saxons, converted, 31; builds churches in London, 32; death of, 35
Sees, early, dates of foundation of, 74; consecration to seven, by Plegmund, 102; held in plurality in eleventh century, 141, 144; elections to be made to by chapters at Court, 197
Selsey, founded by Wilfrid, 54; foundation of monastery of, 66; See of, *ib.*, note; See of transferred to Chichester, 166
Separation between secular and ecclesiastical matters, 167
Sermons, provision for in Middle Ages, 510
Severus, Bishop, accompanies Germanus to Britain, 12
Sherborne, beginnings of See of, 48, 70; See of transferred to Salisbury, 166
Sigbercht, King, plants the Church in East Anglia, 47; sends for Felix, a Burgundian, *ib.*
Sigebert, King, baptism of, 50; allows settlement of Church among East Saxons, *ib.*
Siddena, Stow, See of Lindsey, 61, and note, 147
Simony, organised system of, under Rufus, 176
Siric, Archbishop of Canterbury, advises buying off the Danes, 123, note
Siward, Bishop, coadjutor-bishop of Eadsige, 147
Spearhafoc, Bishop, refused consecration by Archbishop Robert, 148
Spencer, Bishop, "crusade" of, 448; ignominious return of, 456; effect of crusade of, to advance Lollardism, *ib.*
Stafford, Archbishop of Canterbury, conducts trial of Bishop Pecock, 472
Stapleton, Walter, Bishop, character of, 399, 400; death of, *ib.*
Statute, *De viris religiosis*, 378; *Circumspectè Agatis*, 382; of Carlisle, 394; of *Articuli cleri*, 397; first of *Provisors*, 408; first of *Præmunire*, 409; confirming *Præmunire*, 410, note; second of *Provisors*, 453; second of *Præmunire*, 454; declaratory of royal supremacy, 484; *De Hereticis Comburendis*, 457; against Lollards, 466; of Henry IV. and Henry V. against Papal intrusions, 485; limiting the *Præmunire* Statute, 493
Stephen, King, accession of, due to Church influence, 218; pledges himself to allow liberty to Church, *ib.*; character of, 219; keeps none of his promises, 220; seizure of bishops by, 221, 222; cited to council, 223; appears by representatives, *ib.*; obtains virtual triumph, 224; forbids bishops to attend Council at Rheims, 227; banishes Archbishop Theobald, 228; is reconciled to him, 229; death of, *ib.*; importance of his reign ecclesiastically, 230
Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, first priest of Assandun, 139; made bishop of Elmham, 146; deprived of See, *ib.*; bishop of Winchester, *ib.*; made archbishop of Canterbury by Witan, 149; seizes Robert's Pall, *ib.*; promotion of

unfortunate, *ib.*; not allowed to dedicate Waltham, 151; summons Witan at Westminster, 154; crowns Harold, 155; taken by William to Normandy, 157; consecrates Remigius, *ib.*; deposed at Winchester, 159; imprisoned for life, *ib.*
Stigand, Bishop, nominated to See of Selsey, 160
Stokes, Peter, employed by the Archbishop against Wycliffe's party at Oxford, 435, 436; summoned to Lambeth, *ib.*
Stow, Siddena, ancient See of Lindsey Bishopric, 61, and note, 147
Stratford, Archbishop of Canterbury, quarrel of with Edward III., 403; character of, *ib.*
Sudbury, Simon, Archbishop of Canterbury, tries Wycliffe at St. Paul's, 421; Bulls against Wycliffe directed to, 422; murder of in Wat Tyler Rebellion, 427; not unfavourable to Wycliffe's views, *ib.*
Sunday, restraint of work on, 99, 104, 118, 138
Swinderby, William, opinions of, 445; process against, 446; after history of, *ib.*
Synod (see *Council Ecclesiastical, and Convocation*).

T

Taylor, William, burning of, in 1422, 467
Templars, suppression of in England, 395
Tertullian, passage of relating to Christianity in Britain, 4
Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, succeeds to primacy, 223; introduces civil and canon law, 224; styled *Legatus natus*, *ib.*; attends council in spite of king's prohibition, 227, 228; honour paid to, 228; banished, *ib.*; lays land under interdict, *ib.*; reconciled to the king, 229; regent of the kingdom till coming of Henry, *ib.*
Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, a monk born at Tarsus, 57; selected by Pope Vitalian for Canterbury, *ib.*; has the Eastern tonsure, *ib.*; consecrated and sent to England, 58; begins visitations, *ib.*; appoints bishops, *ib.*; reconsecrates Chad for Lichfield, *ib.*; instructs people in learning, *ib.*; accepted as archbishop of the whole land, 58; summons council at Hertford, 59; deposes Winfrid and consecrates Saxulf, 59; consecrates Earconwald to London, *ib.*; brings about general adoption of Roman uses, 60; introduces auricular confession, *ib.*; divides the Northumbrian See, 60, 61; supersedes Wilfrid at York, 61; again divides the See, *ib.*; divides the Mercian diocese into five, *ib.*; holds council at Hatfield, 62; deposes Trumbercht from Hexham, *ib.*;

appoints Cuthbert to Lindisfarne, *ib.*; translates Eata to Hexham, *ib.*; reconciled to Wilfrid, *ib.*; death and character of, 63; introducer of parochial system, *ib.*; obtains right of patronage for those who built churches, 68, and note
Thetford, See of, transferred to Norwich, 166
Thomas I., Archbishop of York, nominated to See of York, 160; applies to Lanfranc for consecration, 162; obliged to promise obedience to See of Canterbury, *ib.*; goes to Rome, *ib.*; obtains dispensation for illegitimacy, 163; claims independent Metropolitan dignity from Pope, *ib.*; referred by the Pope to a council, 164
Thomas II., Archbishop of York, dispute of with Anselm as to primacy, 202; consecrated with profession of subjection to Canterbury, 203
Thoresby, Archbishop of York, orders use of Lay-folks' Catechism, 510
Thorpe, William, examination of before Arundel, 459, 460
Thurstan, Abbot, violent proceedings of at Glastonbury, 174
Thurstan, Archbishop of York, election of, to York, 206; applies for consecration to Archbishop Ralph, *ib.*; consecrated by Pope Calixtus, *ib.*; obtains Papal exemption from subjection to Canterbury, *ib.*; banished by the king, *ib.*; declines to consecrate William of Corbeil, 209; goes to Rome to guard privileges of York, *ib.*; obliged to yield precedence to Canterbury, 213; avoids attending Westminster Synod, *ib.*
Tithe, the Saladin, ordinance for, 278
Tithes ordered to be strictly paid, 787, 81; confirmation of, by King Ethelwulf, 94
Tonsure, dispute as to form of, at Whitby, 52; the Eastern method of, 57
Tostig, Earl, journey of to Rome, 152; upbraids the Pope, *ib.*
Transubstantiation, doctrine of, opposed to Ælfric's teaching, 128
Trumbercht, Bishop of Hexham, 61
Trumhere, Bishop of the Mid-Angles, 10
Trumwine, Bishop of Southern Picts, 61
Tuda succeeds Colman at Lindisfarne, 53; supports Roman uses, 54
Turold transferred to Peterborough to oppose Hereward, 174
Twenge, Sir Robert de, leader of the Lewythiel, 322; obtains redress at Rome, 323
Tynemouth, foundation of, 54

U

Ulf, Bishop, made bishop of Dorchester, 147; found ignorant at Vercellæ, *ib.*; obtains confirmation in See by bribery,

URBAN.

ib.; driven into exile, 148; deposed by Witan, 149
Urban V., Pope, demands arrear of English tribute, 415

V

Valuation of ecclesiastical revenues in 1291, 383
Veil, the Lenten, 98
Verulamium, place of martyrdom of St. Alban, 4
Vicarages, foundation of by Council of Oxford, 316
Vitalian, Pope, addressed by King Oswy, 57; selects Theodore as archbishop, 57
Vivian, Cardinal, not allowed to act as Legate in England, 271

W

Wadden, John, burning of, 468
Walkeline, Bishop, nominated to See of Winchester, 160; attempts to get rid of monks from Winchester, 171; foiled by Lanfranc, *ib.*
Waltham, foundation of as a College by Harold, 151; dedicated by Archbishop Cynesige, *ib.*; founded as an Abbey by Henry II., 272
Warelwast, William, Bishop, sent to Rome to oppose Anselm, 193; informs Anselm that he must not return to England, 194; sent to Rome when blind, 205
Warham, Archbishop, supporter of literary men, 496; value of primacy of, *ib.*
Wells, foundation of See of, 103
Weseham, Roger de, promotion to Lichfield, 338
Wessex, conversion of, 47; Christianity of, due to Roman sources, 51
Westminster Abbey, built by Edward the Confessor, 154; dedication of, *ib.*; Harold crowned in, 155; completion of rebuilding of, 368
Whitby, Conference at, 52, 53, 54
Whithern, Church at, 13
Whyte, William, burning of, in 1428, 467; opinions of, *ib.*
Wighard, sent to Rome for consecration, 57; carried off by pestilence, *ib.*
Wight, Isle of, conversion of, 66; in diocese of Winchester, 70
Wilfrid, Bishop, taught at Lyons and Rome, 52; tutor of Alchfrid, *ib.*; takes chief part in the Conference at Whitby, 52, 53; on division of his See appeals to Rome, 61; goes to France for consecration, 63; obtains possession of York, *ib.*; work of in Mercia, *ib.*; beautifies York Cathedral, *ib.*; builds churches at Ripon and Hexham, *ib.*; active labours of in the north, 64; embroiled with King Ecfrid, *ib.*; gives the veil to Queen Etheldreda, *ib.*; banished from Northumbria, *ib.*; diocese of divided, *ib.*;

WINCHELSEA.

appeals to Rome, *ib.*; work of in Friesland, *ib.*; decision on case of at Rome, *ib.*; takes part in the Synod at Rome, 680, 65; returns to Northumbria, *ib.*; is thrown into prison, *ib.*; released and goes to Mercia, *ib.*; preaches the Gospel to South Saxons, *ib.*; founds religious house at Selsey, 66; returns to the See of York, *ib.*; again banished, *ib.*; adminsters See of Leicester, *ib.*; at the Council of Easterfield, 67; again appeals to Rome, *ib.*; allowed to return to Northumbria on conditions, *ib.*; goes back to Mercia and dies at Oundle, *ib.*; character of, *ib.*
William of Corbeil, Archbishop of Canterbury, cause of the election of, 208; declines to be consecrated by Archbishop Thurstan, 209; goes to Rome for Pall, *ib.*; makes compact with Pope as to Roman Legate, *ib.*; goes to Rome with Legate, 212; accepts the office of Legate of the Pope, *ib.*; repulses Archbishop of York, 213; swears allegiance to Matilda, *ib.*; holds Synod at Westminster as Legate, 1127, *ib.*; favours accession of Stephen, 218; death of, 223
William, St., Archbishop of York, account of, 226, 227; takes possession of his See, 227; poisoning of, *ib.*, note
William I., King, ecclesiastical policy of, 156; crowned by Archbishop Ealdred, 157; takes English prelates with him to Normandy, *ib.*; charter of decreeing separations of civil and ecclesiastical causes, 168; importance of this act, 169; vigorously asserts royal supremacy, 169, 170; practises investiture of spiritual persons, 170; refuses homage to the Pope, *ib.*; requires submission of the clergy, *ib.*; favours secular canons rather than monks, 171
William II., King, simony and profligacy of, 176, 186; refuses to fill up primacy, 178; illness and promises of, 179; nominates Anselm to primacy, *ib.*; makes conditions with him, 179, 180; involved in quarrels with Anselm, 180, 181; proceedings of, at Hastings, 181; renewed quarrel with Anselm, 182, 183; unable to carry his point about the Pall, 184; refuses Anselm leave to go abroad, 185; increased oppressions of on the Church, 186; death of, *ib.*
William, Bishop, consecrated Bishop of London, 148; restored to See of London, 150
Willibrord, Archbishop, labours of, among the Frisians, 71
Winchelsea, Robert, Archbishop of Canterbury, consecration and enthronement of, 385; calls convocation at Bury St. Edmunds, 1296, 386; in London, 1297, 387; refuses to yield to king's demands, 388; reconciliation of, with Edward I., 389; summons Convocation 1397, *ib.*;

refuses to join in protest of barons, 392; implicated in plans for dethroning Edward, *ib.;* tried and punished by Pope, 393; return of from banishment, 394; proceedings against Templars under, 305
Winchester, foundation of See of, 48; Wini, first bishop of, *ib.;* division of See of, 70
Winchester, Council of, 1070, removes English prelates, 159; of 1072, determines the primacy of Canterbury and bounds of province, 164
Winchester, Synod of, 1076, enacts clerical celibacy, 166; other canons of, 167
Winchester Abbey, attack on by townspeople, 368
Windsor, Council of, bishops nominated at, 160
Windsor, Synod of, 1070, deposes English bishops, 160; of 1072, finally settles primacy of Canterbury and precedence of bishops, 164, 165
Wingfield, Battle of, 44
Wini, Bishop, brought into Wessex by king, 48; first bishop of Winchester, *ib.;* expelled from his See, *ib.*
Witham Priory founded by Henry II., 272
Withred, King, laws of, in support of the Church, 69
Wodeford, William, writes against Wycliffe's doctrines, 471
Worcester, foundation of See of, 61; long held in plurality with York, 142
Worcester Cathedral, consecration of, 1218, 314
Wulfelm, Archbishop, advises Athelstan in his laws, 103
Wulfred, Archbishop, consecration of, 90; the Pall sent to, from Rome, *ib.;* quarrel of with King Kenulf, 91, 92
Wulfstan, Archbishop of York, consecrates Church of Assandun, 139
Wulfstan, St., Bishop, made Bishop of Worcester, 153; efforts of to suppress slave trade, 153, 172; makes a claim before the Council of Winchester, 160; work of at Worcester, 172; translation of, 314
Wulfwig, Bishop, succeeds Ulf at Dorchester, 150
Wycliffe, John, birth and early life of, 415, and notes; opinions of, as to Church

property, 416; recommend him to John of Gaunt, 417, 420; commissioner to the Pope, 418; condemns wealth of the Church, 419; summoned to appear before Convocation, 420; escapes censure by aid of John of Gaunt, 421; nineteen propositions of, sent to Pope, *ib.;* Bulls against, issued by Pope, 432; defends himself against Pope's censures, 424; summoned a second time to St. Paul's, 425; before the bishops at Lambeth, *ib.;* excuses the violence in Westminster Abbey, 425; opinions of on Church property merely theoretical, 426; causes which led him to turn his attention to theological topics, 426, 427; discredit thrown on by Wat Tyler's rebellion, 427; theological propositions put out by, 1381, 427; called in question at Oxford, 429; defence of doctrine on the Eucharist by, *ib.;* condemned at Oxford, 430; abandoned by John of Gaunt, *ib.;* "Confession" of, on the Eucharist, *ib.;* cause of, espoused at Oxford, 431; "poor priests" organised by, 432; why not summoned in 1382, 439; translation of Bible by, 439, 442; English tracts of, 439, 440, 443; explanation of views of, 440, 441; summoned to Rome, 442; letter to the Pope of, 443; death of, 444; exhumation of bones of, *ib.;* value of work of, *ib.;* condemnation of tenets of at Constance, 450; literary opponents of, 471
Wykeham, William of, Bishop of Winchester, chancellor, 417; defended by Convocation, 420

Y

Yevering, baptisms at, 40 and note
York, designated as the See of a Metropolitan, 27; conference at, as to abandoning idolatry, 39; baptism of Eadwin and his family at, *ib.;* first germ of Minster of, *ib.;* burning of Minster of, 158; rebuilding of, 165; Council of, under Hubert Walter, 285; decrees of, *ib.*, 286

Z

Zacharias, Pope, letter of, to English clergy, 77

Printed by R. & R. Clark, *Edinburgh.*

BW5020 .P46 v.1
A history of the English church.
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00035 7196